

THE MACDONALD
PRESENTATION VOLUME

Editorial Committee

WILLIAM G. SHELLABEAR

EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

ELBERT C. LANE

RUTH S. MACKENSEN

THE MACDONALD PRESENTATION VOLUM



A TRIBUTE TO DUNCAN BLACK MACDONALD,
CONSISTING OF ARTICLES BY FORMER
STUDENTS, PRESENTED TO HIM ON HIS
SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY, APRIL 9, 1933



1933

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

COPYRIGHT, 1933
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINTED AT THE
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY, U.S.A.

DEDICATION

MORE than forty years ago, there came to Connecticut to assume a position on the faculty of the Hartford Theological Seminary, a brilliant young Scot, fresh from advanced studies at the University of Berlin, and giving promise of noteworthy leadership in the fields of Old Testament and Semitics. From that time on, the name of Duncan Black Macdonald has been a symbol of all that is most significant in Semitic scholarship. Against a steady background of Old Testament teaching, with memorable courses in exegesis and interpretation, Professor Macdonald developed as his primary interest an authoritative mastery of the language and literature, the theology and the philosophy, the laws and the history of the Semitic world in general, the full content of Islam in particular.

His many lectureships in important colleges and universities and the many articles he has contributed to various publications, notably the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, as well as his stimulating teaching in classroom week after week and year after year, always fresh and convincing—these all are slight evidences of the vast reservoirs of knowledge and spiritual appreciation from which and through which he has so richly served the ecclesiastical and the academic world.

Upon the occasion of his seventieth birthday, a group of his students, most of whom have worked under his direction at Hartford, either in the Theological Seminary or the Kennedy School of Missions, are eager to do him honor, and have prepared this Presentation Volume of various representative studies. These essays are dedicated to Professor Macdonald not only as the results of scholarly research, but also as a tribute of personal affection. They carry with them also the unexpressed felicitations of many others who have come under the influence of a truly great teacher.

This volume is thus offered in congratulation upon a distinguished career already well rounded, and in hope that there may be given to him and to the world many more years of creative effort issuing from his mature scholarship.

These brief words of explanation and introduction come from one who counts himself of the host who have been instructed and inspired by Duncan Black Macdonald.

ROBBINS WOLCOTT BARSTOW

*Office of the President,
Hartford Seminary Foundation
August 2, 1932*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
BARSTOW, ROBBINS WOLCOTT— <i>President of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.</i> "Dedication."	v
MACKENZIE, WILLIAM DOUGLAS— <i>President Emeritus, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.</i> "Duncan Black Macdonald: Scholar, Teacher, and Author."	1
ADAMS, CHARLES C.— <i>President of Seminary Faculty, Theological Seminary and School for Evangelists; Missionary of the United Presbyterian Church, Cairo, Egypt.</i> "Muḥammad 'Abduh and the Transvaal Fatwā."	11
BAILEY, MOSES— <i>Associate Professor of Old Testament, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut.</i> "David the Reubenite, a Messianic Figure in Three Religions."	31
BIRGE, J. KINGSLEY— <i>American Board of Publication Department, Stamboul, Turkey.</i> "Yunus Emre, Turkey's Great Poet of the People."	43
BUTLER, PIERCE— <i>Professor of Library Science, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.</i> "Fifteenth Century Editions of Arabic Authors in Latin Translation."	61
CALVERLEY, EDWIN E.— <i>Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.</i> "Al-Abhari's 'Īsāghūjī fī 'l-Mantiq'."	73

	PAGE
DONALDSON, DWIGHT M.— <i>Missionary of the Presbyterian Church, Meshed, Persia.</i> “al-Ya‘qūbī’s Chapter about Jesus Christ” (Translated from the <i>Ta’rīkh</i> , edited by Houtsma, Vol. I, pp. 74-89).	87
† DOOLITTLE, MARGARET— <i>Former Teacher of Latin and History in Hillside School, Norwalk, Connecticut; former missionary of the Presbyterian Church, Tripoli, Syria.</i> “Lessons in Religion and Ethics” (a translation of a Muslim text-book in religion for primary schools).	107
ELDER, E. E.— <i>Principal Ezbekiya School for Boys, Missionary of the United Presbyterian Church, Cairo, Egypt.</i> “Al-Ṭahāwī’s ‘Bayān al-Sunna wa-’l-Jamā’a.’ ”	129
FINKEL, JOSHUA— <i>Brooklyn, New York.</i> “Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan Influences on Arabia.”	145
FISKE, G. WALTER— <i>Professor of Practical Theology and Religious Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.</i> “Modern Objectives in Religious Education.”	167
FLIGHT, JOHN WILLIAM— <i>Department of Biblical Literature, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania.</i> “Some Observations on the Problem of Semitic Alphabet Origins.”	179
GRANT, ELIHU— <i>Professor of Biblical Literature, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania; Director of the Haverford Archeological Expeditions.</i> “Excavations and their Results at Ain Shems.”	193
† Deceased October 24, 1932.	

Table of Contents

ix

PAGE

HADIDIAN, YERVANT H.— <i>Secretary of the Armenian Missionary Association of America, New York, New York.</i>	
"Philonism in the Fourth Gospel."	211
HODOUS, LEWIS— <i>Professor, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.</i>	
"The Introduction of Buddhism into China."	223
JOHNSON, ELMER E. S.— <i>Professor of Reformation and Modern Church History, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut.</i>	
"Augustus Charles Thompson: Student in Berlin, 1838-1839."	237
LOVELL, FLORENCE BELL— <i>Assistant Professor of Religion, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York.</i>	
"The Portrait of Jesus in the Sayings Source."	263
MACKENSEN, RUTH STELLHORN— <i>Hartford, Connecticut.</i>	
"The Present Literary Form of the Balaam Story."	275
MERRILL, JOHN E.— <i>President of Aleppo College, Aleppo, Syria.</i>	
"A Christian 'Word of Testimony' for Use with Muslims."	293
MILLER, BARNETTE— <i>Associate Professor of History, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.</i>	
"The Curriculum of the Palace School of the Turkish Sultans."	303
RANDALL, WILLIAM MADISON— <i>Professor of Library Science, Graduate Library School, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.</i>	
"Three Engraved Stones from the Moritz Collection at the University of Chicago."	325
SARTON, GEORGE— <i>Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D.C.; Editor of Isis.</i>	
"Remarks on the Study and the Teaching of Arabic."	331

SHELLABEAR, WILLIAM G.— <i>Professor of Muhammadanism, Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford, Connecticut.</i>	
“A Malay Treatise on Popular Sūfī Practices.”	349
THOMSON, WILLIAM— <i>Associate Professor of Arabic, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.</i>	
“Khārijitism and the Khārijites.”	371
TITUS, MURRAY T.— <i>Superintendent of Moradabad District, North India Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, Moradabad, India.</i>	
“Islām and the Kingdom of God.”	391
TROUT, JOHN M.— <i>Minister of the Federated Church, Sandwich, Massachusetts.</i>	
“A Study in the Development of Christian Social Ethics—with Special Reference to the Period of the Reformation.”	403
WASER, RAYMOND ALBERT— <i>Minister of the Enfield Congregational Church, Enfield, Connecticut.</i>	
“A Brief Study of the Relationship between the Eighth Chapter of Proverbs and the Prologue of St. John’s Gospel.”	425
WILD, LAURA HULDA— <i>Professor of History and Literature of Religion, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts.</i>	
“An Observation upon Tyndale’s Linguistic Genius.”	455
A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PROFESSOR MACDONALD’S WRITINGS UP TO HIS SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY, APRIL 9, 1933.	471

WILLIAM DOUGLAS MACKENZIE
*President Emeritus, Hartford Seminary Foundation,
Hartford, Connecticut*

DUNCAN BLACK MACDONALD:
SCHOLAR, TEACHER, AND AUTHOR

DUNCAN BLACK MACDONALD:
SCHOLAR, TEACHER, AND AUTHOR

By WILLIAM DOUGLAS MACKENZIE

THE former students of Duncan Black Macdonald have desired that the volume which they are producing in his honor, in token of their abiding gratitude and affection, should comprise a brief account of his career as a teacher and scholar. And they have asked me to prepare this statement, as one who has been associated with him at Hartford for thirty years.

Duncan Black Macdonald was born at Glasgow, Scotland, on April 9, 1863. He got his Arts degree at Glasgow University in 1885, having won the first prize in English literature, which was taught by the brilliant John Nichol. At the Divinity School of the University Macdonald won, besides other prizes, the Black Fellowship which enabled him, having taken the degree of B.D. in 1888, to go to Berlin University. In 1888 he also was licensed to preach by the Glasgow Presbytery of the Established Church of Scotland. He was at Berlin from the summer of 1890 till the autumn of 1891, and was there again for a period of study in 1893. He received the honorary degree of D.D. from Trinity College, Hartford, in 1909, and from his own University of Glasgow in 1920.

In 1892 Macdonald accepted an invitation from President Hartranft to become instructor in Semitic languages at Hartford Theological Seminary, and became one of the enthusiastic band of young scholars who were brought to Hartford in the early 'nineties.

On January 22, 1898, he married Miss Mary Leeds Bartlett of Hartford, a true helpmeet in his work, and companion of his foreign travels, until her death on August 3, 1929.

On the academic side of his life Macdonald has had a distinguished career. Early in his years at Hartford he became interested in providing special courses for men who were looking

forward to missionary work in Muhammadan lands. In fact the courses he offered in Arabic and Syriac in his very first year, 1892, had this service in prospect. His annual reports to the President of the Seminary, throughout the years of his professorship, showed that Macdonald was, in addition to his work as teacher of Hebrew and Old Testament exegesis, giving an ever increasing amount of time to instruction in the Arabic and Muslim field with a special emphasis on the missionary enterprise. This must in part account for the fact that so many of the most powerful missionaries in Turkey for nearly a generation were graduates of Hartford Theological Seminary.

When in 1899-1900 a special course in foreign missions was established by the faculty as a whole, Macdonald contributed his own share from his own department.

In 1907-1908 Macdonald was granted leave of absence. He spent his sabbatic year abroad, seven months at Cairo, several months in a journey through Palestine and Syria, and visits to Beirut and Constantinople. An important fruit of this year was the delivery of the Hartford-Lamson Lectures in 1909 on "Aspects of Islam."

In 1910 occurred the great World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh. In the following winter Dr. Macdonald had as a student, with whom he spent many hours of individual instruction, the famous and brilliant Anglican missionary at Cairo, the late Canon Gairdner, who had taken a prominent part in the Edinburgh Conference. In the same winter the first steps were taken to organize a special School of Missions at Hartford. It was to be no longer a mere department of the Theological Seminary, but a distinct though closely affiliated school. Into this enterprise, so heartily undertaken by the whole faculty, Macdonald put his own strength and contributed very largely to the world-wide reputation of what, two years later, became known as the Kennedy School of Missions. He was appointed head of the Muhammadan department and only those who were most closely associated with him were aware of the amount of work which he put into that service. The present writer protested repeatedly when, on inquiry, he found that Macdonald was giving as much as eighteen hours a week of class and individual instruction. The only

relief he would accept was the removal of his responsibility for the Hebrew beginners' class in the Seminary. Later his state of health compelled Macdonald to drop his work for the Kennedy School though he was ever willing to give informal advice and assistance when requested to do so. And that was at times not inconsiderable.

It should be recorded that Dr. Macdonald had a vital share in originating and moulding the unique methods employed by the Kennedy School in granting the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to candidates who prove their quality, both in scholarship and in capacity for research work, on the mission field. These methods were used with special thoroughness by Dr. Macdonald in his teaching, and have resulted in the publication of books in his own field which he views with satisfaction. These methods have now been adopted elsewhere and are contributing powerfully to increase the efficiency of many missionaries in Asia and Africa.

Dr. Macdonald was called to the chairs of Arabic in two of the largest universities on this continent; but he felt the pull of the opportunity for a distinctive service at Hartford and declined each of these invitations decisively.

He has had the following appointments: American Lecturer on Mohammedanism at the Congress of Arts and Science, St. Louis Exposition, 1904; Haskell Lecturer at the University of Chicago, 1906; Special Lecturer at Wellesley College, 1907, 1909, 1912; at Cambridge Episcopal Divinity School, 1912; Hartford-Lamson Lecturer, 1909; Haskell Lecturer at Oberlin, 1914; Lecturer at Berkeley Divinity School, 1917, 1918. He is a member of the Royal Asiatic Society (Great Britain), the American Oriental Society, and honorary member of the Arab Academy of Damascus.

The Bibliography attached to this volume presents a record, believed to be almost complete, of those publications which are known to have come from the pen of Dr. Macdonald. There were many reviews of books by him which were published anonymously, especially in *The Nation* of New York, which are not included. It may be sufficient to call attention in a few words to some of the more significant features of this

bibliography. It comprises a list of three books which have made their mark among authorities on Muslim life and theology. Those are: *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory* (1903); *Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* (1909); and *Aspects of Islam* (1911). There are also twelve chapters or papers contributed to works of composite authorship; nearly eighty articles contributed to the four volumes of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, which is published at Leyden, Holland; seventeen articles in the eleventh edition (1910) of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*; four articles in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*; four articles in *A New Standard Bible Dictionary*; three articles in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

The Bibliography comprises also a long list of articles in various learned journals, some of which have had strong influence among scholars. These have appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, the *American Historical Review*, the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, the *Yale Review*, *The Nation*, the *Moslem World*, the *Hartford Seminary Record*. Special interest attaches to Dr. Macdonald's connection with the journal called *Isis: International Review devoted to the History of Science and Civilization*. This was founded by Dr. George Sarton, author of three large volumes entitled, *Introduction to the History of Science*, which are published for the Carnegie Institution of Washington. In his introduction to the first volume (p. 45) of that great work Dr. Sarton makes the following statement which will be interesting to the authors and readers of this volume: "During the course of a short vacation in Pemaquid, Maine, in September 1920, I became happily acquainted with Dr. Duncan B. Macdonald, professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, who has been ever since my faithful and indefatigable mentor for all matters pertaining to Islām. . . . Dr. Macdonald has remained my main guide, and my debt to him is one which cannot be requited." Dr. Sarton may be glad to know that Dr. Macdonald has said to the present writer concerning their cooperation: "There is no part of my life as a scholar on which I look back with more satisfaction than this."

In 1915 *Isis* was founded by Dr. Sarton in Belgium. Later it became the official organ of the society which bears that name,

and Dr. Macdonald, who was from the first a council member of the society, became an associate editor of *Isis*. He is a frequent contributor to the reviews department of that periodical. His connection with Dr. Sarton and with *Isis* arose from the fact that Dr. Macdonald has been for long deeply concerned with the Muslim contribution to science as part of its notable influence on the history of civilization as a whole. On various aspects of that subject Dr. Macdonald has been a pioneer investigator, as is specially evident in his extremely technical article on "Continuous Re-creation and Atomic Time in Moslem Scholastic Theology," an article which opens up a field with which our most advanced mathematical philosophers have been concerned in recent years.

The vast field of Muslim scholasticism had been ignored for long, and Dr. Macdonald is recognized as one of those who have done most to recover the interest in it of modern scholars. Very early in his career he made his mark here with "The Life of al-Ghazzali," which appeared in 1899 in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.¹ This has been followed up with a long series of writings for which reference must be made to the Bibliography. Not only science, but music and ritual, mysticism and metaphysics, politics and theology have all been dealt with. The influence of the Muslim system upon medieval Christian theology, even upon Thomas Aquinas, broke new ground for subsequent investigators. And we must not ignore the fact that the groundwork of the whole is a constant dealing with Arabic grammar and philology, which also receive specific attention in various articles and reviews.

As far back as 1892 Macdonald had already made his mark in the world of learning by finding in the British Museum the manuscript of an Arabic version of the Gospels. On this he based a chapter contributed to a composite volume which was published in 1905 in honor of the Spanish scholar Francisco Codera.

In the summer of 1908 Dr. Macdonald had the good fortune to discover in the Bodleian Library at Oxford an Arabic manuscript of *Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves*, whose existence was

¹ Referred to by William James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 402.

then unknown. He later discovered the name of the man who had been the scribe of the manuscript. From a photograph of the manuscript Dr. Macdonald published the text in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1910) and gave an account of its scribe in a later article in the same periodical (1913). Only three originals of the famous story are known to exist; namely, Galland's French version in his *Nuits*; the analysis of the story which is in Galland's *Diary* (now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris) and which also Dr. Macdonald published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1913); and the Bodleian Arabic text.

The Bibliography contains many items which reveal Dr. Macdonald's interest in the *Thousand and One Nights*, popularly known simply as *The Arabian Nights*. (See items in the Bibliography for the years, 1906, 1908, 1910, 1913, 1919, 1924, 1932.) He has more completely explored the origin and the whole history of that famous collection than any other scholar; and his splendid Arabic library, which is one of the most precious special libraries in this country, contains the largest collection of editions of the *Thousand and One Nights* to be found anywhere in the world. He has labored for many years at the collation of the various versions or recensions, for which he alone has all the relevant and necessary material.

Finally it has to be recorded that amid all this absorption in the history of Islām, in all its aspects, Dr. Macdonald has been deeply concerned with another specific field, namely, the Old Testament. If he has published less on that field, it has been because the Islāmic field has had fewer lives devoted to its cultivation. But his various articles on Job and Ecclesiastes and other parts of Hebrew literature indicate that when he does produce the fruits of his work, they will be found to be as original and important as his work elsewhere. His former students and his colleagues are looking forward with special interest to the day when his course on "Hebrew Literary Genius" will be given to the world. It is now ready for publication and will prove to be one of the most important contributions to the understanding of the Old Testament. The very title suggests an approach that will open up a view of the various types of Hebrew literature with

their varieties of historic background, of artistic structure, as well as of religious significance, which few men have been competent to undertake. And other gifts lie beyond that, for which may he have length of days and abundance of strength!

The list of contributors to this Presentation Volume is not only a proof of the far-reaching influence of Dr. Macdonald's work; it is a spontaneous expression of personal admiration, gratitude and affection for one who has added to his great gifts as scholar and teacher the unstinted devotion of a friend and fellow worker in the greatest of all causes.

CHARLES C. ADAMS

*President of Seminary Faculty, Theological Seminary
and School for Evangelists; Missionary of the
United Presbyterian Church, Cairo, Egypt*

MUḤAMMAD ‘ABDUH AND THE TRANSVAAL
FATWĀ

MUḤAMMAD ‘ABDUH AND THE TRANSVAAL FATWĀ

By CHARLES C. ADAMS

ONE of the noted figures of the last century in Egypt, and, indeed, in all the Muslim world, was Shaikh Muḥammad ‘Abduh (1849-1905), who gained much fame among his contemporaries as a zealous reformer of the religion of Islām and one of the leading modern advocates of the adaptation of Islām to the conditions of modern civilization.¹ Of the many offices and positions of influence which he held in the course of an active and varied career, none, perhaps, affords better illustration of the manner in which he turned every position to account in the interests of the reform movement which he was endeavoring to inaugurate, and of the liberal and modernizing spirit which characterizes his activities and his writings, than the office of Grand Muftī of Egypt which he filled from June 3, 1899, until his death in 1905.

‘Abduh was the choice of the Khedive ‘Abbās II for this office, although it is significant of the attitude of suspicion and opposition which the Khedive entertained, even at this time, toward Muḥammad ‘Abduh, and which he continued to cherish with increasing bitterness until the latter’s death, that he did not offer him at the same time the rectorship of Al-Azhar University; especially, since the retiring Muftī, Shaikh Ḥassūnah al-Nawāwī, had held the double office of Muftī and Rector of Al-Azhar (*Shaikh al-Azhar*).² ‘Abduh was at first inclined to reject the

¹ The authoritative account of the life of Muḥammad ‘Abduh is the Arabic biography, in three volumes, by Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, ‘Abduh’s chief disciple and his successor in the leadership of the reform movement. The work is entitled: *Tārīkh al-Ustādh al-Imām al-Shaikh Muḥammad ‘Abduh*. Vol. I contains the biography, Vol. II the collected writings, and Vol. III, eulogies and biographical accounts written at the time of ‘Abduh’s death. A briefer biography by the author of the longer one appears in the magazine *Al-Manār*, Vol. VIII (1905). A considerable literature exists in European languages, dealing with ‘Abduh’s life and work.

² *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 602.

office. It was, it is true, the highest office in the gift of the Islāmic Law (*Sharī'ah*); and, as Grand Muftī, he would be the chief jurisconsult of the State and the official interpreter of the *Sharī'ah* as applied to all matters referred to him by the government, and his official deliverance (*fatwā*) on any matter would be authoritative and final. At the time of his appointment, however, it had become the practice to restrict the *fatwās* to matters referred to the Muftī by the departments of the government and to refuse to give *fatwās* on questions presented by individuals.

The matters on which decisions were most frequently sought by the government arose mainly from two sources: One source was the frequent complaints and appeals regarding decisions rendered by the *Sharī'ah* Courts (*al-Mahākīm al-Shar'iyyah*) on matters of personal status, particularly those relating to divorce. These matters were referred to the Muftī by the Ministry of Justice.³ For another reason the government was obliged to appeal to the Muftī, namely, for a *fatwā*, from the point of view of the *Sharī'ah*, permitting the execution of the sentence of capital punishment pronounced by the Criminal Courts. When Muḥammad 'Abduh took office the deliverance of this *fatwā* had become a matter of form, as previous Muftīs had generally been content to sign a prepared form without reviewing the case in question. The general sense of this formal *fatwā* was as follows: "If it has been established that this man has killed the other, deliberately and with full intention, on this condition decision is given that he should be put to death. If it has not been established, the decision is invalid." 'Abduh refused to sign such a form and insisted that he should be permitted to review the record of all evidence presented in each case and the documents pertaining to the case and thereupon, after careful study of each case, he gave his *fatwā*, together with the considerations upon which he based it.⁴

In still another respect 'Abduh reversed the practice of his predecessors in office, namely, in giving *fatwās* in response to questions presented by individuals. These questions arose from the

³ *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 646, 'Abduh has a lengthy *fatwā* on the harmful effect produced on the homes by the incompetent decisions of these courts. He also dealt with the reform of these courts in his *Report on the Sharī'ah Courts*.

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 646.

necessity of adapting the multitudinous details of the *Sharī'ah* to the conditions of modern life or of reconciling Muslim beliefs and Muslim points of view with modern science and modern thought. Two of 'Abduh's *fatwās* may be referred to, by way of illustration: one, in reply to the question, submitted by a Muslim of India, "Is it permissible for Muslims to seek the help of unbelievers and heretics in order to bring about the supremacy of Islām?" ; the second, in reply to the question, "Did Noah's flood cover the whole earth?"⁵ The best example, however, of this class of *fatwā* is the one given in reply to three questions submitted by a Muslim of the Transvaal, South Africa, and known in consequence as the "Transvaal Fatwā." This is perhaps the best known of 'Abduh's *fatwās* and the one that caused the greatest amount of discussion in the newspapers at the time of its issue. Even the Khedive 'Abbās II made it the occasion of intrigues against the Grand Muftī.⁶ The greatest difficulty was found in the Muftī's reply to that one of the three questions which concerned the eating of animals slain by Christians in a manner that does not agree with that prescribed by the *Sharī'ah*, and 'Abduh was charged with declaring lawful food that the *Sharī'ah* distinctly declares to be unlawful. In reply to the charges brought against the *fatwā*, some of 'Abduh's friends secured statements in defense of the *fatwā* from four well known 'Ulamā of Al-Azhar, one representing each of the four accepted rites of canon law. These statements, together with the text of the original questions from the Transvaal and the text of 'Abduh's *fatwā*, were published in a booklet of forty-eight pages, entitled *Direction of the Islāmic Community to the Declarations of the Imāms concerning the Transvaal Fatwā*.⁷ The text of the questions is also given in *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 676, but the full text of the *fatwā* does not appear there, although quotations are made from it and the *fatwā* is discussed at great length; nor is the text to be found in *Al-Manār*, Vol. VI, in which this material originally appeared. Of

⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 648 ff., 666 ff.

⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 668 ff., 560, 565, 586, etc.

⁷ *Irshād al-Ummah al-Islāmiyyah ilā aqwāl al-A'immah fī al-fatwā al-Transfālīyyah*. Printed and published on the responsibility of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Kharmūsh al-Baḥrāwī al-Azhārī. 1st ed., Cairo A.H. 1322 (A.D. 1903-1904). This booklet is now difficult to secure.

the contemporary newspapers and journals, one, states Rashīd Riḍā,⁸ published the text of the three questions and the *fatwā*. This was *Al-Zāhir*, a newspaper which appeared at irregular intervals, and which had been founded by Muḥammad Bey Abū Shādī at the instigation of the Khedive, Rashīd Riḍā, says, to oppose Muḥammad ‘Abduh and his party.⁹

The following is the text of the three questions concerning which a *fatwā* was desired by the Muslim from the Transvaal:¹⁰

(1) There are individuals [Muslims] in this country who wear the hat in order to carry on their business and secure the return of profit to themselves. Is this permissible or not?

(2) The manner in which they [i.e. Christians of the Transvaal] slaughter animals intended for food differs [from the manner prescribed for Muslims] because they strike cows with an axe and after that they slaughter [i.e. cut their throats], without repeating the *basmalah* [“In the name of God”]; and small cattle they also slaughter without repeating the *basmalah*. Is this permissible or not?

(3) The Shāfi‘ites perform the public prayers standing behind the Hanafites, without repeating the *basmalah*, and they perform the prayers behind them on the occasion of the two feasts. It

⁸ *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 685.

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 563. The first number of *Al-Zāhir* appeared November 12, 1903. On December 19 of that year, no. 32, the first reference to the *fatwā* in question occurs, under the title “How can that be declared lawful which God has declared unlawful?” On December 23, no. 33, an appeal to the Muftī to suppress the *fatwā* occurs. On December 31, no. 40, an article on the subject refers to the publication in *Al-Zāhir* a few days previously of the text of the *fatwā*. No. 39, December 30, does not contain the text, nor does no. 37, December 28, nor any of the preceding numbers. No. 38, December 29, is missing from the files (of the Royal Library, Cairo). It is probable that this missing issue contained the text. (There is no indication of the reason for the loss of this number. Several later numbers of the same newspaper are also missing from the files.) Following the publication of the text there is a series of ten articles dealing in a destructive way with various aspects of the *fatwā*, especially the question of eating animals slaughtered by Christians. Another article presents the views of the Khedive on the question. Then follows an appeal, addressed to the scholars and leaders of the Muslim world to unite in suppressing such *bid‘ah* from Islām.

¹⁰ *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 676. The text as given in *Irshād al-Ummah*, p. 7, differs slightly from the above.

is well known that there is a difference of opinion between the Shāfi'ites and the Ḥanafites, whether repeating the *basmalah* and the *takbīrs* of the two feasts is obligatory or not. Is it permissible to perform the prayers, the one behind the other, or not?

The text of the *fatwā* which was given in reply is as follows:¹¹

"The wearing of a hat, if the one who wears it does not intend thereby to leave Islām and enter another religion, is not to be considered as constituting the wearer an unbeliever; and if wearing it is to meet some need, such as to protect from the sun or prevent some undesirable result or to make possible some advantage, it has likewise not been considered as 'disliked' because the idea of conformity to another religion has disappeared entirely.

"As for slaughtered animals, my opinion is that the Muslims in those distant parts should follow the text of the Book of Allāh [the Qur'ān], where He says: 'And the food of those who have been given the Book is lawful for you' [sūra v: 7]; and that they should rely upon what the illustrious Imām Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī the Mālikite has said, namely, that the chief point to be considered is that what is slaughtered should be intended to be eaten by the Christians, both clergy and laity, and should be regarded as food for the whole body of them. For, if it is their custom to take the life of an animal, in whatsoever manner it may be done, and after the slaughtering, the chiefs of their religion are accustomed to eat of it, it is permissible for the Muslim to eat of it, because it is then called 'the food of the People of the Book.' The Christians in the time of the Prophet were in a condition similar to their condition today; especially since the Christians of the Transvaal are among the most intolerant in their religion and the strictest in their adherence to their religious books. Therefore everything that belongs under the head 'slaughtered' is to be considered as 'the food of the People of the Book,' so long as the slaughter has taken place according to the custom which has been approved by chiefs of their religion. The occurrence of the noble verse: 'Today there is made lawful for you the good things, and the food of those who have been given the Book is lawful for you,' etc. [sūra v: 7], after the verse declaring unlawful that which has died of itself and that which has been devoted to other gods than

¹¹ *Irshād al-Ummah*, pp. 8, 9.

Allāh, is in the nature of a refutation of any wrong opinions that might be held in the way of declaring the food of the People of the Book to be unlawful because they believe in the deity of 'Īsā [Jesus]. For they all were in that state [of belief] in the time of the Prophet, except those of them who turned Muslims. Moreover, the expression 'the People of the Book' is unlimited, and it is not proper to interpret it as applying only to this small, individual group [i.e. the Christians in the time of Muḥammad]. Consequently, this verse is like an explicit verse in declaring their food lawful, so long as they, in their religion, hold it to be lawful, in order to prevent embarrassment in intercourse with them and dealings with them.

"In regard to the prayer of the Shāfi'ite behind the Ḥanafite, there is no doubt in my mind concerning its correctness, so long as the prayer of the Ḥanafite is correct according to his own rite; for the religion of Islām is one. It is the duty of the Shāfi'ite to know that his Imām is a Muslim, correct in the performance of the prayers, without showing intolerance in his regard for his Imām. Whosoever seeks for anything else than this, regards Islām as a number of religions not one religion. And it is not permissible for an intelligent person to entertain such an idea among Muslims, few in number, in a land all the inhabitants of which are non-Muslims, except those unfortunate few."

All three of these questions owed their origin to the fact that the Muslims of the Transvaal were a minority in the midst of a Christian majority. The laws and customs of the country, consequently, reflected the civilization, beliefs, habits, and tastes of the Christian majority, not those of the Muslim minority. The matter of conformity on the part of a Muslim to any of the practices of the Christian society in the midst of which he lives involves questions of grave importance; for he is thereby substituting some other practice instead of that prescribed by the *Shari'ah*, the regulations of which cover all conceivable details of his public and social affairs, as well as his private and family life. Some Muslims of the Transvaal, it is stated in the first question, had found it advantageous to conform to the practices of the Christian society around them so far as to wear the hat for the transaction of business and in ordinary intercourse. The prac-

tice, however, raises questions in the mind of the conscientious Muslim. Is the practice contrary to some express stipulation of the *Sharī'ah*? Does the *Sharī'ah* regulate the headdress as it does other details of personal practice, as, for example, the cut of the beard? Or, still more seriously, may the Muslim who wears a hat not be proclaiming thereby, even though unintentionally, that he has discarded the religion of Islām and embraced Christianity, and consequently rendered himself an unbeliever, inasmuch as the hat is commonly held among Muslims of the East to be the distinctive headdress of Christianity, since it is worn almost exclusively by Europeans, as the turban or the fez (*ṭarbūsh*) is held to be the distinctive headdress of Muslims?

The Muftī, in his reply, declares the essential element in the case to be the intention of the wearer. If he does not intend to leave Islām and embrace another religion, he is not made an unbeliever by wearing a hat. It is the intention which determines whether "imitation" or "conformity" (*tashabbuh*) has been merely outward and formal or whether it has been real. In taking this position 'Abduh is in agreement with the jurists, who declare that conformity does not become actual except through the purpose (*qaṣd*) of the person who conforms.¹² If the purpose in the mind of the one who wears the hat, 'Abduh means to say, is simply the thought of necessity or convenience or utility, or of commercial and social advantage (all these considerations applying in principle to the case of the Transvaal, the last mentioned particularly so, according to the terms of the question), there is no place for the idea of religious compromise. Since the idea of conformity or compromise "has entirely disappeared," to use 'Abduh's phrase, and the motive of utility or advantage is the only one to be considered, the wearing of the hat does not involve apostasy from Islām; so far from it, it has not even been

¹² *Irshād al-Ummah*, p. 715. The full statement of Rashīd Riḍā is as follows: "The jurists (*fuqahā*) declare that conformity does not actually take place except through the purpose (*qaṣd*). It is disliked (*makrūh*) in ordinary affairs such as dress, for the sake of preserving separateness. As for religious affairs, if the purpose is unbelief, conformity makes one an unbeliever; if the purpose is not unbelief, conformity is *ḥarām* (unlawful, i.e., though forbidden it does not make one an unbeliever)."

considered "disliked" (*makrūh*) by the jurists, under the condition of motive mentioned.¹³

In making the motive of "advantage" a decisive factor in determining the decision on this question, 'Abduh is entirely consistent with the two principles which he considered essential to the interpretation of the *Sharī'ah* and its adaptation to modern conditions. One of these principles is that all applications of the *Sharī'ah* or enactments based upon it should promote the common welfare and be adapted to the requirements of the time; the other principle being conformity to the essential teachings of the Qur'ān and the genuine *Sunnah*. The second of these two principles is also observed in this section of the *fatwā*, since there is presupposed as the basis of it the fact which Rashīd Riḍā has pointed out explicitly in his defense of the *fatwā*, namely, that there are no proofs in either the Qur'ān or the *Sunnah* to indicate that the wearing of the hat is prohibited. *Irshād al-Ummah* (p. 46), referring to the same fact, says that the *Sharī'ah* has no clear statement regarding dress except in connection with the prohibition of silk and gold and silver, but people were left to their own customs in this respect. Traditions are quoted to show that the Prophet wore a Byzantine tunic before the Byzantines entered Islām; and that he also wore a kind of sandals peculiar to monks, the use of which he justified by saying that they were necessary for long journeys and that the appearance of imitation does no harm. The same work points out that the hat is a racial or national form of headdress rather than religious and that the wearing of it, therefore, cannot be a distinctive mark of unbelief. Rashīd Riḍā goes farther by showing that the wearing of the hat is not peculiar to Christians. The Afghan soldiers, he says, wore a form of hat before they knew Europeans, and today the people of Persia, Turkestan, Bukhara, etc., wear a kind of hat. Even the official dress of the Turkish 'Ulamā is modelled on the religious dress (not the ordinary dress) of the Christian clergy and the Shaikh-al-Islām in Stambūl is distinguished by white vestments similar to those worn by the Greek Patriarch.¹⁴ To the contention of the opponents of the *fatwā* that the wearing of the hat is a sign

¹³ *Irshād al-Ummah*, p. 715.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 716.

of conformity and therefore of unbelief, according to the tradition: "If any one imitates a people he is one of them," Rashīd Riḍā replies that the tradition, even if it be granted that it is trustworthy as claimed, has a more general meaning than that involved in the wearing of the hat. Its meaning is that if any one imitates a people, he conducts himself as they do in the matter of customs, and therefore one should imitate noble people rather than unworthy people in order that he may be honored and not dishonored.¹⁵

The third question (omitting consideration of the second question for the moment), concerns the differences in the details of the prayer ritual as practised by the four rites, or schools, of canon law which are recognized by orthodox Islām. Two only of the rites, the Shāfi'ite and the Ḥanafite, are mentioned in the question, as the only ones, probably, involved in the situation in the Transvaal. The point at issue is the validity and binding character of those distinctions in the ritual of the public prayers. Are they so valid and so binding on the followers of each rite, that the Shāfi'ites, for example, are not permitted to join in the public prayers when the prayers are being performed according to the Ḥanafite rite, with a Ḥanafite Imām (leader, in this case of the public prayers) leading, but must perform the prayers separately according to their own rite, the Shāfi'ite? For the statement in the question, "The Shāfi'ites perform the prayers standing behind the Ḥanafites," implies that the Ḥanafites are being led by their own Imām and are performing the prayers according to their own rite. The Shāfi'ites, if they wish to join in the prayers, must therefore follow the Ḥanafite Imām, with the utmost fidelity and exactness, in all the details of the Ḥanafite ritual. The same problem would be presented to the Ḥanafites if a Shāfi'ite Imām were leading the congregation according to the Shāfi'ite ritual. Naturally, the question arises, Can the follower of one rite recognize that prayer which is performed according to the ritual of another rite is equally as valid as his own? Is it permissible for him to perform the prayers according to a different ritual in order to join in the public prayers in the mosque, or is he bound to maintain that

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 715.

his own ritual is the only valid form of prayer and refuse to recognize the prayer of the other rites or to join in their ritual?

Two points of difference between the practice of the Shāfi'ites and the Ḥanafites in the performance of the public prayers are mentioned in the question. The first is the *tasmīyah*, or repetition of the phrase "In the name of God," etc. (*bi-sm ʾillāhi*), which the Shāfi'ites consider obligatory, according to the statement of the question, and the Ḥanafites omit, not holding it obligatory. The statement, however, is not correct with respect to the Ḥanafites, as *Irshād al-Ummah* has pointed out (p. 8). The author of the question was led astray by the fact that he had not heard the Ḥanafites pronounce the *tasmīyah*, whereas they consider the repetition of it inaudibly, and even audibly, a *Sunnah* duty, that is, laudable because practised by the Prophet, although not absolutely obligatory (*farḍ*). The second point of difference mentioned in the question is with regard to the number of *takbīrs* (*Allāhu akbar*, "God is greater," or similar phrase) which are required to be pronounced in the special service of prayer on the first day of each of the two great feasts, the "Feast of Ramaḍān," otherwise called the "Lesser Feast," which immediately follows Ramaḍān, the month of fasting, and the "Feast of Sacrifice," or the "Great Feast," on the tenth day of Dhū 'l-Ḥijjah, the month of pilgrimage.

These points of difference relate to details of minor importance, yet they fairly illustrate the minute, and oftentimes hair-splitting, distinctions which separate the four orthodox rites. Muḥammad 'Abduh, in his reply to this question, does not enter into a discussion of these details but at once states his conviction that the ritual of the Shāfi'ites and that of the Ḥanafites are equally valid and that it is entirely correct and proper for the followers of either rite to perform the prayers under the leadership of an Imām of the other rite; and, by inference, the same applies to all of the four rites. Only one condition attaches to this permission, namely, that the Imām, of whatever rite, should be able to perform the prayers correctly according to his own rite. This much the Muslim is bound to know regarding the Imām who directs the prayers, whatever be his rite. But for a Muslim to go beyond this and intolerantly insist that the Imām should be of

his own rite and no other, is to prove that this individual Muslim has no conception of the unity of Islām; for by his intolerance he has made it as impossible for Muslims who adhere to different rites to pray together as if they belonged to four different religions instead of the one religion of Islām. For the sake of preserving the unity of Islām, therefore, particularly in a land where Muslims are in the minority, it becomes the duty of the intelligent Muslim to minimize the differences between the rites and to recognize the validity of all of them by joining in the public prayers as though there were only one ritual for all. This emphasis upon the unity of Islām and disparagement of the differences created by the four rites of canon law is again a characteristic note in the 'Abduh literature. In order that the unity of Islām might be restored 'Abduh advocated a return to the earlier simpler practices represented by the *Sunnah* (Usage) of the Prophet and that of the first four *Khulafā'*, and the adoption, by scholars representing all four rites, of a minimum body of religious practices which have always been recognized as constituting an essential part of Islām, that upon this minimum of essential practices Muslims everywhere might be united, instead of being divided, as at present, by the innumerable and often inconsequential details of the four schools.

The second question remains to be considered. The *fatwā* gives a more lengthy reply to this than to the preceding questions, as will be seen at a glance, because the subject involves numerous points of discussion that have been dealt with at great length by books of traditions, commentaries and books of law. The question whether it is permissible for Muslims to eat the meat of animals that have been slaughtered by Christians, as in the Transvaal case, or by Jews, who are generally linked with Christians in the discussions of the question, inasmuch as both are known generally as *ahl al-kitāb*, or "People of the Book," i.e. the Bible, or more simply as *Kitābīs*, is by no means a simple one as dealt with by the books of canon law. 'Abduh, however, has attempted to make his reply as simple as possible, avoiding casuistical details, in order to meet the situation in the Transvaal, where the Muslim minority cannot afford to be isolated by unnecessary

restrictions from their Christian neighbors nor separated from one another.

‘Abduh first appeals to the explicit statement of the Qur’ān (sūra v: 7), which he advises the Muslims of the Transvaal to take in its literal and absolute sense: “And the food of those to whom the Book [i.e. the Bible] has been given is lawful for you.” A number of other Qur’ān passages have a bearing upon this same topic; and since ‘Abduh builds part of his argument later upon the order in which these passages occur, it is desirable to quote them here. They are as follows (Palmer’s translation):

ii: 168: “He has only forbidden for you what is dead, and blood, and flesh of swine, and whatsoever has been consecrated to other than God.”

v: 4: “Forbidden to you is that which dies of itself [*al-maitah*] and blood, and the flesh of swine, and that which is devoted to other than God, and the strangled [*al-munkhaniqah*] and the knocked down [*al-mawqūdhah*], and that which falls down [*al-mutaraddiyah*] and the gored [*al-naṭīḥah*], and what wild beasts have eaten—except what ye slaughter in time [*mā dhakkaitum*—and what is sacrificed to idols, and dividing carcases by arrows.”

v: 6: “They will ask thee what is lawful for them? say, ‘Lawful for you are good things and what ye have taught beasts of prey (to catch), training them like dogs;—ye teach them as God taught you;—so eat of what they catch for you, and mention the name of God over it, and fear God.’ ”

v: 7: “Lawful for you today are good things, and the food of those to whom the Book has been given is lawful for you and your food is lawful for them.”

It is the verse last quoted which ‘Abduh gives as the basis of an absolute permission to eat the food (including meats) of “People of the Book,” with apparently no conditions attached. The fact that this verse, with its permission to eat the food of Christians, comes after the verse prohibiting the eating of *al-maitah*, etc. (v: 4), shows that Inspiration has anticipated the possibility that difficulties might arise in the minds of some regarding such a permission, on the ground that Christians believe in the deity

of 'Īsā (Jesus) and are therefore not unitarians; therefore, it is the part of this verse to "ward off" any such suspicions regarding the lawfulness of eating Christian food, since it is essentially an explicit verse. There has been no change in the belief of Christians since the time this permission was given; they believed then as they do now regarding Jesus. Moreover, the absolute form of the statement in the verse does not allow limitation of the permission to the Christians existing in the time of the Prophet, inasmuch as they would be, compared with those who have lived since that time, a small and particular group. The permission contemplates the food of Christians, understanding "Christians" in the widest and most general sense. One limitation 'Abduh attaches to the permission, by referring to a *fatwā* on this subject delivered by one of the earliest Mālikite Imāms, Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī. This interpretation stipulates that the animals intended for food should be considered lawful according to the requirements of the religion of the "People of the Book" and should be slain in the manner prescribed therein and that not only the laity but also the clergy should eat from the meat. There would thus be no doubt that the meat was lawful from their point of view and could be called, without question, "food of the People of the Book" and would thus be lawful for Muslims.

It will be noted by a comparison of this part of the *fatwā* with the question to which it is a reply, that the *fatwā* has brushed aside the technical details, as they may be called, upon which the question is based, and, in effect, declares that they are not essential to the decision. The Christian manner of slaughtering animals, the question states, differs from the Muslim manner; and three points are distinguished which seem to make the food unlawful according to Muslim law. (1) The larger animals are first struck with an axe (*bulṭ*), presumably upon the head, although this is not stated. This manner of killing would seem to place them in the class called *al-mawqūdhah* ("knocked down"), the eating of which is forbidden. (See sūra v: 4, above.) The opponents of the *fatwā* made much of this point, charging that 'Abduh had legalized what had clearly been declared unlawful. (2) The animal is then slaughtered, that is, its throat is cut. This opera-

tion, known as *dhabḥ*, consists, according to Muslim requirements, in completely severing the gullet and the jugular vein, with a sharpened instrument, cutting from the front of the neck, without lifting the instrument until the act is completed. The important question, however, is whether *dhabḥ* occurs before or after life becomes extinct. According to all the rites of canon law, *dhabḥ* must occur before the last spark of life has disappeared. It then constitutes *tadhkiyah* of the victim, which signifies etymologically "completion," and, according to the terminology of the jurists, is that which makes the eating of the flesh lawful. There are a number of recognized means of *tadhkiyah*: *dhabḥ*, which applies particularly to smaller animals, like sheep and goats; *naḥr*, stabbing in the throat, which applies to camels, horses and cows; taking of prey by dogs in the hunt, etc.¹⁶ Another element in *tadhkiyah* is that killing should be for the purpose of eating. Thus Rashīd Riḍā says: "Legal *tadhkiyah* is that which has taken place of man's purpose to the end of killing an animal that it may be eaten. If he carries this out himself, he may do so with any sharpened, wounding instrument, even though it be a stone, except that there are traditions prohibiting *tadhkiyah* by means of the teeth or the nails."¹⁷ (3) Christians do not repeat the name of God over the victim when they slaughter. This is called *tasmiyah*, and must accompany the act of slaughtering, and in hunting it must accompany the shooting of the arrow or the loosing of the dogs upon the prey. It is considered essential to *tadhkiyah* by the majority of the rites, but there are differences of opinion concerning its being a condition without which the meat would not be legal.

In regard to the question of *al-marwqūdhah*, Rashīd Riḍā replies to the charges of the opponents that the Transvaal victims, which have been struck with an axe, cannot belong to this class, by definition. For *al-marwqūdhah*, according to Al-Baidāwī's commentary on this passage, "is that which has been struck with anything like a piece of wood or a stone so that it dies from the effect of the blow." And Al-Rāzī says that *al-marwqūdhah* be-

¹⁶ *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 680; *Irshād al-Ummah*, p. 9.

¹⁷ *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, p. 681.

longs with *al-maitah*, under the head of forbidden meats, because "it has died and its blood has not run out." The axe, on the other hand, is a sharp, wounding instrument, and the blow is for the purpose of slaughter for eating, not for destruction; and even if the victims were considered as belonging to this class, the fact that *dhabh* follows would make them lawful.¹⁸

In regard to the matter of *tadhkiyah* while life remains, Rashīd Riḍā maintains that there is nothing in the Transvaal question to show that life does not remain after the blow, indeed it is rather to be presumed from the question that it does remain. In that case, the opinion of the jurists is preponderantly in favor of the lawfulness of eating. The Shāfi'ites require some decided "movement of the victim," such as quivering of the flesh before *dhabh* takes place, not afterward, to show that the life is "continuous" (*mustaqirrah*); but the other rites allow that any slight movement at the time of *dhabh*, such as the flicker of an eyelid, a movement of the tail, or a kicking of a leg, is sufficient proof that life was existent.¹⁹ If, on the other hand, it is not known whether *tadhkiyah* took place in time or not, nor how it took place, the "Agreement" of orthodox Islām holds that the food of Christians is lawful.²⁰

As for the matter of *tasmiyah*, it is the general practice in slaughtering, approved by all the rites. They differ, however, on the question whether it is legally required in order that eating of the meat may be lawful. The Shāfi'ites and the Ḥanbalites do not make it a condition, permitting its omission either through negligence or of intention, both by the Muslim and the *Kitābī*; the Mālikites do not make it a condition for the *Kitābī*, while the Ḥanafites make it a condition not to be omitted intentionally, but its omission through negligence or through ignorance of its being a condition is permitted. There are also differences of opinion among jurists within the same rite. Thus, one statement, related as from Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal makes *tasmiyah* a condition both for the Muslim and the *Kitābī*, while another version is in the con-

¹⁸ *ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 682, 686, 687.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, pp. 696, 715, etc.

²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 715.

trary sense.²¹ All these regulations, however, apply specifically to Muslims and it is generally agreed that Christians and Jews are not held responsible for the practice of them. Accordingly, the majority of the great jurists, both earlier and later, have held it lawful to eat animals slain by Christians and Jews, even though they did not repeat the name of God over the animals, and even if they repeated the name of some other, as 'Īsā (Jesus) or 'Uzair (Ezra).²² The "Agreement" (*Ijmā'*) which holds that the food of *Kitābīs* is lawful if the manner of *tadhkiyah* is unknown, covers the general situation in the Transvaal and other Christian and Jewish countries, where it is not possible for the Muslim to know how the meat was slaughtered which is sold in the markets.²³ The stipulation which 'Abduh added, that the meat should be eaten by the clergy as well as by the laity is one not required by the majority of the 'Ulamā.²⁴

Why 'Abduh gave his *fatwā* according to the Mālikite rite by introducing a stipulation based on the *fatwā* of a Mālikite Imām, Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī, has been the subject of conjecture. As Muftī of Egypt his official *fatwās* must follow the Ḥanafite rite, the official rite of the government, although 'Abduh in his student days learned the law according to the Mālikite rite.²⁵ Individual *fatwās* may differ according to the rite professed by the questioner; but the Shāfi'ite and the Ḥanafite are the rites mentioned in the question from the Transvaal. 'Abduh's opponents charged that he meant thereby to set up a claim to be an *Imām Mujtahid*, thus placing himself on a level with the great authoritative jurists who developed the rites. Perhaps the conjecture of Rashīd Riḍā is as near the truth as any: that 'Abduh did not intend to go beyond the "Agreement" in point of practice but added the stipulation of Ibn al-'Arabī as a precautionary measure in deciding who the Christians are whose food is to be eaten. In general, the jurists have considered any to be Christians or Jews who claimed to be so; but there is a tradition from 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib that he refused to call the Banū Taghlib Christians because "they took

²¹ *Irshād al-Ummah*, pp. 10-16.

²² *Tārīkh*, Vol. I, pp. 682, 689.

²³ *ibid.*, p. 689.

²⁴ *ibid.*, pp. 682, 683.

²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 683.

nothing from the Christians but the drinking of wine.” ‘Abduh’s stipulation that the practice of the learned men and chiefs of the Christians should determine the question of lawfulness may have been added with this tradition in mind.²⁶ As for ‘Abduh’s claim to be a *mujtahid*, Rashīd Riḍā’s reply is: (1) All the ‘Ulamā allow that it is proper to follow (*taqlīd*) one of the Imāms in some cases and a different one in others, and all well known Muftīs have given *fatwās* that differed from the rite which they professed; and (2) Muḥammad ‘Abduh is, after all, a *mujtahid*, for it is not fitting for one who can interpret the Qur’ān and write on theology as he does to be a *muqallid*, one who receives his opinions at second hand. Besides, the grace-gifts of God are not confined to any specific age nor to certain special persons²⁷—which is another characteristic note of the ‘Abduh teachings.

²⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 682, 683.

²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 691.

MOSES BAILEY

*Associate Professor of Old Testament, Hartford
Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut*

DAVID THE REUBENITE,
A MESSIANIC FIGURE IN THREE RELIGIONS

DAVID THE REUBENITE, A MESSIANIC FIGURE IN THREE RELIGIONS

By MOSES BAILEY

DAVID the Reubenite belongs to the early sixteenth century and the days of the Inquisition. In the first person he tells his own strange story.¹

David claims to be the son of Solomon, the late king of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Menassah,² who dwell in the Wilderness of Habor. His older brother Joseph now reigns over these three hundred thousand Israelites, and in his rule is supported by "the seventy elders." As ambassador from this Hebrew kingdom, David set out upon a tour through Muslim and Christian countries, bearing a secret message which he nowhere in his book fully discloses. From Habor,³ accompanied by an aged deaf and dumb slave, he went to Jidda, ten days' journey. From there he sailed in three days and three nights to Suakin in the "Land of Kush." A long illness detained him there, and he not only let much blood—fifty litres altogether, he says—but one hundred times seared his face and body with red-hot nails. (Not the least impressive feature of this strange mission must have been the appearance of the messenger.) At Suakin David bought two camels and joined a caravan of Turks going toward the kingdom of Sheba.⁴ Two months' journey brought them to Lemoule (?), the capital of Nubia and residence of King 'Omrah ('Omar?). Here he says that he remained ten months, continuously honored by one Abu Kamil and his sixty thousand Muslim followers. David offers some interesting descriptions of Nubian customs: the wandering of the king's court from place to place,

¹ *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes*, edited by Ad. Neubauer, second volume, Oxford, 1895. A translation of about half of the text, from a different MS., however, and some notes, were published by Dr. Edward Beberfeld, *Der Reisebericht David ha-Reuben*.

² David forgot that David ben Jesse was a Judean!

³ For geographical references, see the later discussion.

the manner of camping, the clothing of the people; and, in the course of relating his own affairs, he describes the peculiar state of religious unrest in and near Abyssinia at that time.⁴ He does not tell what was his message to the king. "I was before them a man of few words." But he did claim to be a Muslim in good standing, and presented himself everywhere as a "son of the Prophet." Throughout his travel in Muslim countries he was constantly honored with this title. But David's glorious career in the Abyssinian world was abruptly ended by the arrival of another missionary, a man from Mecca who brought "the book of the Prophet." Of this book, David said to the king, "We know not whether it be truth or falsehood." The unpleasantness which followed sent our hero off toward Cairo. His description of the long journey is exciting, though none too clear. On his way he received a delegation from King Joseph his brother, who presented him with two lion's kittens. With these beasts he later bribed the customs officials at Cairo to let him enter without paying the usual ten per cent duty.

From this point, the geographical references are clearer and more complete, and the strange story increases in interest.

At Cairo David evidently intended to resume the rôle of Jew. He went to Rabbi Abraham "the mint-master" to request hospitality and assistance from the Jewish community. The Rabbi, for whom David expressed bitter hatred, refused to have anything to do with an erstwhile Muslim, lest he be thought to have made a convert. The unfortunate ambassador found quarters with one Sarf al-Din. Here his trusted deaf and dumb slave died; from this time forward David was in a perpetual stew of quarrelling servants. The first disaster resulting was the theft of a chest containing gold pieces and pearls.

From Cairo David journeyed to Ghazza; recognizing him as a son of the Prophet, a pious Muslim furnished him for the time a richly appointed camel. At Ghazza chance placed David in the same room with a Jew named Abraham Donats. In him the ambassador confided, though he says, "Yet I did not wish to reveal to him my secret until I was on the point of leaving." Abraham

⁴ *cf.* the fascinating story of Zar'a Ya'qob, partially translated in the *Moslem World*, Vol. XI, no. 3, by the present author.

sent David off riding on a donkey and accompanied by a donkey-driver. "Pressing on day and night" they arrived at Hebron at noon of the fourth day.⁵ The Shaikhs in charge of the great mosque related to him some of the local legends of the graves of the patriarchs. Rabbi David prayed and fasted, and the Lord vouchsafed the first miracle of our story, by causing a dry spring in Hebron to bubble up copiously. From Hebron he set out for Jerusalem. Robbers on the way were on the point of attacking him, but in answer to prayer the Lord sent protection. In Jerusalem, at the Dome of the Rock, he prayed and fasted five weeks in all.⁶ Once more messengers came to him from the Wilderness of Habor, bringing him secret instructions. Then, when he had fulfilled his fasting, and the instructions from the seventy elders, the Lord granted a notable marvel: the crescent upon the top of the Dome, which had faced west, was miraculously turned toward the east. Though the keepers of the mosque had it returned to its original position, it was during the following night again turned eastward. It was a terrifying portent visible to all. Thus David's mission in Jerusalem was marked as complete.

The ambassador set out for Rome. At Ghazza with his Jewish friends he drank wine for the first time since leaving home. By sea he travelled to Damietta, then by camel twenty miles to a ship for Alexandria. There he met Rabbi Mordecai, "the beloved Qabbalist." Accommodations while in Alexandria, quarrels with his servants and his neighbors, and the securing of passage to Italy, form a long narrative easily understood by the modern traveller. He sailed to Venice, by way of Candia. From the time of his arrival in Italy, perhaps indeed from the time of his return through Ghazza, he presented himself only as a Jew. Once, in Italy, he "became very angry" because a man addressed him in Arabic, which he feared might reveal his Muslim connections. From Venice he sailed to Pesaro, thence to Rome by way of Castelnuova.

The story of the journey from Habor to Rome amounts to about one quarter of the entire narrative. At this point there is

⁵ Why so long? It is only about forty miles.

⁶ Not continuously, which would be unsuitable for a careful Jew.

a new beginning, "I am David son of Solomon the King, whose righteousness is a blessed memory. . . ."

David remained in Rome just a year, 1524-1525. He had frequent, one may suppose very intimate, conferences with "Cardinal Egidio,"⁷ and several interviews with the pope, Clement VII.⁸ From the latter he secured letters to Prester John, and to King John of Portugal, and the gift of one hundred gold ducats "to show to King Joseph my brother." The purpose of his mission, though he may have informed the cardinal and the pope, he does not set forth in his journal; perhaps we may infer its nature from an episode in Rome. He once concluded a six-day fast by eating some stew at Joseph Zarfati's home. He carefully emphasizes the kindly intent that underlay its preparation, but says that his customary way of breaking fast was with a little sweetened water. The stew made him so ill that his life all but left him. The good Zarfatis, nursing him in this crisis, urged him to confess his sins and so to die in peace. Passionately he answered, "I will not die until I rebuild the altar and accomplish sacrifice in Jerusalem."

His mission in Rome completed, David set out to interview the King of Portugal. By way of Viterbo, where he acted as judge to settle local Jewish difficulties, Bolsenu, where he spent the Sabbath, and Siena, he came to Pisa. At the home of Rabbi Jechiel in Pisa he seems really to have enjoyed himself. He tells of a beautiful garden and a stream, where he went on horseback, and of climbing "a tower near which were three abominable churches." Numerous gifts were presented to him, including a flag upon which were embroidered the Ten Words. David had several flags which were very important to him. The aged Sarah, "may she be blessed above women," was evidently a convert to his ideas, who yet was aware of David's weakness. She presented him with a beautiful book of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, and the Five Rolls, on which she had written in large letters, "Be not angry and be not excited." The Reubenite would have done better to follow the advice. Sarah's niece, "a wise and prudent girl who

⁷ Is this Egidio Casiano, appointed cardinal by Leo X (1517-1523)? Graety, *History of the Jews*, Vol. IV, p. 492 (original English version) thinks it was Guilio, though it seems less likely.

⁸ 1523-1534.

could both read and write," decided not to marry "until she arrived in Jerusalem." David remained seven months in Pisa, awaiting the Portuguese ambassador's written permission to travel. Then from Leghorn he sailed to Almeria, in Spain, and on to Tavira, just over the border in Portugal. By land he went to Almeirim, where the king was holding court. His progress was a triumphal march. Forced Christians⁹ everywhere welcomed him, and by kissing his hand roused Gentile furor: only royalty should be honored by kissing the hand. When he was questioned as to his messiahship, his reply was "Peace, be still!"¹⁰ Once he used the exciting phrase, "till the Hour shall come." In Portugal, delegations came to him from Fez and other North Africa communities.

King John III¹¹ received David in person. At least a part of the "ambassador's" purpose is here revealed. He was in search of guns and ships with which to conquer the land of Palestine. In his country there were mighty warriors, but they had not learned the art of making gunpowder; they must have both weapons and teachers to instruct in their use. King John seems to have been interested. The veracity of David's story was established by the word of a ship captain who had been in India and who claimed to have heard about the Jewish kingdom. "There are many Jews, more than can be counted, in Senegal, ten days' journey from Calcutta," said the captain. So David reports, "And the king promised me eight ships in the month of Nisan, with four thousand guns, both great and small; and I believed his words and departed from him to come to my house."

Meantime, serious difficulties had arisen. The king had heard of the honor that had been done to David in that "all who come to his house, men, women, and children, kiss his hands." Furthermore the sons of the Jews, the forced Christians, ate and drank with him. A spy came to see how David ate.¹² The Reubenite defended himself before the king, saying, "The door of my house

⁹ Marranos. With more or less rigor, professing Jews had been excluded from Portugal since 1496.

¹⁰ Is it significant that he does not bluntly say, No?

¹¹ Ruled 1521-1557.

¹² To see if he observed the dietary regulations.

is open to all men, Christians and Jews, between whom I make no distinction; because I cannot do otherwise than keep my house open to all until thou shalt dismiss me in peace." Several times, in different connections, he insists that he makes no distinction between Jew and Christian. But he had bitter enemies. One Don Miguel at court tried to move the king against the Jewish ambassador. Some of David's servants—a wretched lot—told evil tales abroad. Again he says, "A rumor came to me . . . that the Christians had been drawing a picture of me and were joking about this picture." A petty fight between Gentiles and forced Christians was precipitated, two were arrested, and finally the king intervened. But the most serious episode appears to have been the conversion to active Judaism of one of the king's scribes.¹³ This man came to David requesting circumcision; David refused to countenance such a thing, he says, but the scribe was not dissuaded. It became known to all that the man had become a professing Jew. David was plainly terrified for the consequences; his narrative of the conversion and what followed is quite inadequate, as if our author were unwilling that the whole mystery be published.

So David's mission, which he claims came so near to success, proved a complete failure. The king politely told him that other business prevented the sending of ships and men to the east at that time.¹⁴ David placed the blame upon the influence of Don Miguel at court. The Jewish ambassador was sent away with due courtesy.

An incidental curiosity of the narrative is the story of a great dinner presented by the king to his courtiers, among whom David appeared. David relates: "And from that day when I saw the king drinking water and his brother also drinking water, and abiding in their kingdom, I resolved in my heart to drink no wine. And from the day that I began drinking water I found myself

¹³ Probably Solomon Molcho; more about him later.

¹⁴ "In a letter to Clement VII dated June 28, 1526, he (John III) complains of his poverty and gives this as his reason for not succoring the king of Hungary in his resistance to the Turks." *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 492.

eating more than formerly at my dinner table, and the water I found was better for my fasting.”

To Tavira David returned as he had come. There he remained four months, till finally he had to be forced to leave the country. By mules and then by boat he came to Almeria in Spain, where he was arrested. Neither Spain nor Portugal in 1526 could legitimately receive Jewish guests. Here “a great Ishmaelite prince” came to talk with David. “And he asked me, ‘Why hast thou come from thy country and what dost thou desire of the Christians?’ And because he was exceedingly wise he then showed me reckonings and prepared diagrams, saying to me, ‘The end of the kingdom of the Christians and of the kingdom of the Ishmaelites has come, and within three years the whole kingdom of Edom shall be in the power of the king of Israel in Jerusalem, and all the people shall return to one law.’ And he said to me exalted and terrifying words so that I did not wish to answer him at all.”

From Almeria David proposed, though under guard, to go to Caesar.¹⁵ Our story brings him to Cartagena, where it abruptly ends. A note from another hand than David’s tells us, “Thus far is in the manuscript, but something is missing and I do not know how many columns are gone; therefore we cannot know the end of the story of David the Reubenite.” But there follows the expense account of David’s companion of the latter part of his travels: “These are the expenses which Rabbi Solomon the Cohen contracted for our lord the Prince of the Host, Rabbi David.” The accounts which follow do not tell the secret which David failed to disclose in his incomplete journal.

The balance of truth and fiction in the words of “the Reubenite” perhaps cannot be exactly discovered. With considerable intelligence, David revived certain legendary ideas, accommodated them to his own age, and presented them through a personality which had a weird attraction to many of his people.

The Wilderness of Habor is obviously selected as the home of a Hebrew kingdom because a place of that name is mentioned

¹⁵ So David regularly refers to Charles V.

as an exilic home of Israel after the Assyrian conquest.¹⁶ It is pointless to seek the actual Assyrian Habor in an attempt to locate David's hypothetical kingdom. Rather it may probably be identified with Khaibar, two or three days' camel journey northward from al-Madīnah in Arabia. David certainly spoke Arabic, and therefore he had access to the rather inaccurate traditions of a Jewish community in Khaibar at the time of the Prophet; he overlooked the fact that these traditions inform us that the Jews of Arabia had been exiled or killed. It is probably more than ten days' camel journey from Khaibar to Jidda, but that is near enough to add to the evidence that David intended to identify Khaibar with Habor.¹⁷

That there was a kingdom of Hebrews descended from the "Lost Ten Tribes" was no new idea. The classic fabricator of that notion, Eldad the Danite,¹⁸ had in the ninth century captured the hearts even of Jewish scholars. Eldad's story was too monstrous, and yet geographically too vague to satisfy the sixteenth century. Our Reubenite evidently knew the story of his predecessor, but while adopting its general ideas he avoided its excesses.

David's itinerary in the "Land of Kush" is too inadequate for careful criticism. Some of his distances are measured in terms of a month's journey or more, and the places named are mostly unknown. This, however, is not strange in view of the nomadic character of the Nubians. The author really knew something of the customs of the people, and he may perhaps have been there. It is odd that in his journal he should have told the story of his having passed for a son of the Prophet if he had not played that part, though in the sixteenth century there were good Jews in many places who gave outward allegiance to Christianity or to Islam.

Of external corroboration of the story of our author we have one important bit. Rabbi Joseph the Cohen, a contemporary, in

¹⁶ 2 Kings xvii: 6.

¹⁷ Dr. Edward Beberfeld, *Der Reisebericht*, in his first Excursus, tries to get a different identification.

¹⁸ Jellenik published different versions of this tale.

his *Chronicles*,¹⁹ gives some account of him: "A Jew whose name was David came from a distant country of India unto the court of the king of Portugal in those days, and said to him, 'I am a Hebrew and I fear the Lord the God of Heaven; and my brother the king of the Jews sent me unto thee, O King, for help; and now, help us, and we will go to war against the Turk, Sulaiman, and will take the Holy Land from his hand.' And the king said unto him, 'Be thy coming with peace. And now go, and I will send thee unto the high priest. Whatsoever he shall say, I will do.' And he went from him and abode in Lisbon several days. And the forced Christians believed his words. And each said unto his neighbor, 'He is our deliverer, for God hath sent him.' And they gathered themselves unto him and honored him much. And the man departed thence, and passed through Spain; and in all the places through which he passed many flocked unto him of those who were scattered there; and he was unto them a stumbling-block. And he passed over to France and went to Avignon. And he departed thence and came to Italy;²⁰ and he made banners of cunning work, and wrote upon them the names of the Holy One; and many believed him in those days. And also unto Bologna, Ferrara, and Mantua, came that man; and he said that he would, with the consent of the kings of the uncircumcised, lead all the Jews who were found in the midst of them, unto his place and into his land. And he spake also unto the pope. And the children of Israel feared much. And it came to pass, that they spake unto him saying, 'And what shall we do unto our wives this day, if we shall all go unto the battle, and what unto their children whom they have borne?' Then he replied, 'Surely there are many women in our country like unto these women; fear not for there is no restraint with the Lord to save.' And he invented a writing in his own heart, saying, 'My brother, the king, hath sent it unto me written and sealed with the king's ring.' And it came to pass one

¹⁹ *The Chronicles of R. Joseph ben Joshua ben Meir*, translated by C. H. F. Bialloblotzky, London, 1836; *Emek habacha* (i.e., the Vale of Tears) *von R. Joseph he Cohen*, aus dem Hebräischen ins Deutsche übertragen . . . von Dr. M. Wiener, Leipzig, 1858. The Hebrew text I have been unable to secure.

²⁰ The order of David's narrative differs from that of Joseph.

day that his secret was discovered, and they believed him no more for he decreed decrees of nothingness."

Joseph the Cohen continues with a description of Solomon Molcho, David's convert, and of his great ability in the Qabbala. Then: "And Solomon would speak unto the emperor about the faith, well explained. And he went his way when the emperor was in Ratisbon and he spake unto him there. And the heart of the emperor was hardened, and he hearkened not unto him for anguish of spirit. And he commanded, and they put him in prison, and his friend Prince David, and his men; and they remained there several days." The story of the martyrdom of Solomon follows; Joseph plainly finds the episode inspiring, and he concludes, "Would to God I could write in a book with certainty and sincerity whether his words were true or not." But of the Reubenite he only says that they took him to Spain, "and he abode there many days and died in the prison-house."

The three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, officially hated each other; but their adherents could unitedly puzzle over messianic Qabbala. Prince David, in spite of the Inquisition, interested simple folk of all three groups in his queer message.

J. KINGSLEY BIRGE
*American Board of Publication Department,
Stamboul, Turkey*

YUNUS EMRE
Turkey's Great Poet of the People

YUNUS EMRE

TURKEY'S GREAT POET OF THE PEOPLE

By J. KINGSLEY BIRGE

ONE test of the universality of a poet's genius is that he be claimed by all sorts and conditions of men as one of them. Judged by this standard Yunus Emre stands out as perhaps the greatest figure in all Turkish literature. Dervish orders of various sects quote from his verses to show that he belongs to them. A reference to Abdul Kadir raises the question as to whether he was a Kadiri dervish, and Kadiri traditions seem to confirm this. A reference to the Mevlana is taken as a sign that he is a Mevlevi. A passage in one of his poems has supported the claim that he was a Hurufi. An article in the Turkish Folk Lore Society magazine quotes some verses containing a reference to Ahiler, a word which means literally "brothers," but which is also the name of an ancient order of trade guilds so powerful as to possess a degree of political independence and for a time to hold Angora as its capital, and the article asks if Yunus belonged to this famous organization of craftsmen which flourished during the same century as he did and in much the same area. As we shall see, the widespread Bektashi order claims him especially, and we are dependent almost exclusively on their traditions for any details about his life. Finally, in the literary revolution of recent years, Yunus is claimed as the great poet of the people, the first of any prominence to compose his songs in the Turkish language, a poet so identified with the common people and who so unashamedly used the language of the common people that he stands out as the great national poet, the forerunner by six hundred years of those leaders of recent days who have advocated a simplification of the language and a return to the dialect of the Turkish people as the best medium of literary expression. The interest shown today in Yunus Emre is manifested by a lengthy book by a university professor on the *First Mystics in Turkish*

Literature, nearly half of which is devoted to the life and work of our subject, and by a small brochure published in 1929 by the Folk Lore Society in memory of the 640th anniversary of the only definite date mentioned in any poem attributed to Yunus. Because the beauties of nature play such a part in describing the mystic experiences of the poet, April 15 was selected as "Yunus Day." Two scholars in Constantinople today are making the study of this poet's work their main avocation. Aka Gündüz writing in the Folk Lore Society publication makes the claim that Yunus Emre does not belong in any exclusive way to the mystics. He is rather "a spiritual hero made of steel, who heroically and openly struggled against evil traditions and evil doctrines. Emre, who smashed in pieces by his verses the framework of fear and oppression of his day, is a hero who is not now the property of mysticism, nor has he been that, nor will he be. The brave Yunus is a national crusader, whose desire was to bring his environment, his generation and the generations to come to a new state of vitality and truth. Emre is the great Turk of yesterday, today and tomorrow."

The great modern Turkish sociologist, Ziya Gökalp, who has done so much to lay the foundations for a new study of Turkey's literary and historical past and so bring about the amazing changes of today, is shown in this brochure to have been definitely under the influence of this early poet.

HIS LIFE

Of Yunus himself we know nothing with any certainty, save what we gather from his poems. Gibb, in his *History of Ottoman Literature*, quotes the lines:

And seven hundred and seven was the date
When Yunus laid down his life in this path.

707 A.H. would correspond to A.D. 1307. But this poem is of doubtful authenticity, so that we haven't even that definite date by which to locate his period. In the year 1438, however, a man from Mühlbach was taken prisoner by the Turks, and after living for twenty years in Adrianople, Pergamus, Brusa, and Scio, brought back to his country two poems by Yunus Emre which he copied in Gothic letters and translated into Latin. The fact that

Yunus' poems were known over a wide area in that period confirms, together with other indirect evidence, at least the 1307 date as approximately correct for indicating Yunus' general period.

Whether reliable as detailed history or not, the Bektashi traditions appear to be true to what he might have been, judging by his poetry, and they therefore throw light on his background and personality. According to these traditions Yunus appears first as a poor farm laborer, who in time of drought visits the *tekke*, or lodge house, of Hajji Bektash Veli, the traditional founder of the Bektashi order, and there begs for grain in exchange for a present of fruit. Hajji Bektash Veli receives him with great kindness and keeps him in his *tekke* for several days. Finally, on being pressed, the Shaikh asks him whether he would prefer the wheat or the miraculous influence possible only for those who have attained to a knowledge of God. Yunus chooses the grain, but the Shaikh persists in an effort to persuade him to choose the influence and power of the saintly life. Finally, on the peasant's insistence, wheat is given, and Yunus Emre starts off for home. Having gone only a short distance, however, he thinks over his experience and becomes convinced that he has chosen the lesser good. Turning back, therefore, he confesses his fault, whereupon Hajji Bektash Veli accepts him and directs him to go to the *tekke* of Tapduk Emre, to whose hands he commits Yunus' lock of faith. The latter appoints Yunus as wood carrier for the *tekke*, and in that lowly office he continues for forty years. In all that time no one ever knew him to bring to the *tekke* either a crooked or a damp stick. One day Tapduk Emre, observing this fact, asks Yunus, "On the mountain are there no crooked sticks left?" To which Yunus replies, "On the mountain there are many crooked sticks, but in thy house even crooked sticks are unseemly." For centuries because of this tradition Yunus has been famous as an absolute model of submission to his spiritual leader.

Finally, at the end of this long forty-year period of humble service, the brothers of the lodge are gathered one day in meeting, when Tapduk Emre falls into a state of ecstasy. Turning to a famous song-maker he bids him sing. But the poet is unable to utter a word. So the Shaikh turns to Yunus and says, "Come, thy

time is up. Thy lock is opened. The word of Hajji Bektash Veli has come true." Immediately he commences to pour forth speech and hymns of eloquence and religious insight. Tradition goes on to say that for another forty years he travels abroad, getting to know life and spreading the inspiration of his own faith. His poems confirm it, at least to this extent, that apparently with his leader's permission he visited Mecca, Damascus, and Aintab, giving some addresses in the last place.

One of the commonest traditions of Yunus describes him as being illiterate, unable even to spell out the letters of a word. A careful study of his poems makes this seem improbable. If he composed the five hundred-couplet *mesnevi* attributed to him he must surely have known how both to read and write, and it even seems probable that he was acquainted with Persian as well as Turkish, for he appears to have drawn inspiration from the *mesnevi* of Jalal al-Din Rumi.

The place where Yunus lived is uncertain, but probably somewhere in the neighborhood of the Sakarya River, and while the decision on this matter is doubtless entirely inconsequential, one would like to believe the tradition that he is buried in the village of Emre in the Sanjak of Saruban between Salihli and Kula, the local tradition is so true to the spirit of all Yunus' poems. In that little village of seventy houses there is the tomb of Tapduk Emre and his descendants. On a stone in front of the threshold of the tomb the picture of a little axe is carved, symbolic of Yunus' early career as a woodcutter. A tradition current among the people of the village says that Yunus, who always showed excessive respect and love for his leader, asked in his will that he be buried in front of the door of his Shaikh's tomb so that all visitors coming to venerate Tapduk Emre might press their feet down on his own grave.

HIS WORK

Yunus Emre has left to posterity a single work, his *Divan*. At least three editions of this have been lithographed, and there are extant in various libraries of Constantinople at least fifteen early manuscripts which vary considerably from each other. It appears certain that Yunus had no intention of writing a *Divan*, or formal

collection of poems. He simply composed songs, which quickly became popular, and in later years faithful followers gathered these together in a collection. The latest printed edition of 1340 (1924) contains a long *mesnevi* poem of ten to twelve thousand half lines, written in very imperfect imitation of a Persian meter form, and containing various teachings of mystical philosophy coupled with ethical exhortations. This is followed by the real collection of about three hundred and thirty hymns, written for the most part in so-called Turkish or syllable meter, the lines of each hymn containing the same number of syllables, and with the last syllables of the double lines rhyming.

There appears to be at least one manuscript *Divan* extant dating back as far as about 1400. Osman Nury Bey, writing in the *Milli Mejmua* (No. 129), says he has seen a *Divan* dating from about this period, and in comparing this early *Divan* with later ones, several poems occur with the name Sait appearing in the early copy, but with the name Yunus substituted in later editions. Osman Nury Bey's theory is that Yunus' original name was Sait, and that he is identical with the Sadettin mentioned in the *Vilayetname* of Hajji Bektash Veli. This detailed point of historical criticism cannot further occupy us here. It is significant, however, that several Turks are finding Yunus Emre of sufficient importance to study him in very great detail. At least two Turkish scholars are now at work trying to devise a corrected *Divan* based on a comparison of the available manuscripts.

As Burhan Umit Bey, writing in the *Edebiyat Gazetesi* has well pointed out, more important than questions of name, place of birth, death, etc., of the author is the problem of really understanding the mind of Yunus Emre, and exploring the story of religious experience which a sympathetic appreciation of his poetry alone can reveal. To Köprülü Zade Fuat Bey, Yunus Emre is a "simple peasant." To Burhan Umit Bey, the word simple is entirely misleading, for to him Yunus is a man in whose experience the eternal tragedy of mankind in its full force and infinite variety is reflected. He who has not experienced the hunger of an earnest soul to know God, and who has not lived the life of strug-

gle against all the human handicaps that hold one back, is hardly prepared to understand.

HIS PANTHEISM

It is too much in the short compass of this article to indicate fully the many-sided religious experience of Yunus. Gibb, in his *History of Ottoman Poetry*, translates two poems illustrating Yunus' belief in pantheism, his sense of being one with the powers of nature, and with the experiences of mankind. The following poem shows his pantheism in a form more understandable today, for God is experienced as one who never leaves Himself without a witness; the discerning eyes can see Him at work wherever one looks:

The Sinai which Moses climbed, the Mansion built in the sky,
The trumpet which Israfil sounded, these we have found everywhere.
The Law and the Gospel, the Qur'ān and the Psalms,
The meaning in these we have found everywhere.
The words of Yunus are true, we all have said they are sound.
Wherever you are, there is God; we have found Him everywhere.

HIS LONGING FOR GOD

More characteristic than his pantheism is his sense of passionate longing (*ashk*) for God. This longing or love is more powerful than anything else. Though at times it finds satisfaction in a sense of having found God, for the most part it leaves one with a sense of having pain, and makes one feel a stranger in this world. The following hymn expresses something of the intensity of this longing. The song of the nightingale, to the Turkish mystic, is an unutterably sad song, full of yearning. The nightingale sighs for the rose, and for an understanding of its secret and so becomes a symbol of the human heart reaching out in inexpressible longing for God.

The fire of love has burned my heart,
And will keep on ever burning;
My lonely head has endured this love,
And will keep on ever enduring.

A feeling of separation has filled my soul;
I have become a Lover of that Loved One;
The Friend has suspended on my neck the chain of love,
And will keep on ever suspending.

Though no one be blamed,
 The pain of my heart is unhealed;
 The bitter tears of my heart have flowed;
 And will keep on ever flowing.

The nightingale sighs and mourns;
 Its heart has burned with longing,
 As for my heart, O my soul,
 It reached out to God and will reach.

Yunus speaks these words;
 His nightingales make their complaint;
 In the garden of the Friend he has plucked roses,
 And will keep on ever plucking.

In the following poem there is reference to his travels and to his perpetual search for a companion with whom he can feel full fellowship in his spiritual search after complete union with God, yet hardly wishing for another the pain he feels:

I wonder if there is here
 Such a Stranger as I;
 His heart wounded, his eye tearful,
 Such a Stranger as I.

I have wandered through *Rûm* and *Shâm*,
 Through many countries afar,
 Though I sought, I could never find
 Such a Stranger as I.

May no one else be such a stranger
 May none feel such fire of separation;
 O my teacher, may no one else be
 Such a Stranger as I.

A stranger has died, they say,
 Three days later they hear of him;
 With cold water they wash him,
 Such a Stranger as I.

My tongue speaks, my eye weeps,
 My trust is in the strangers.
 If only my star in the sky
 Were such a Stranger as I.

How can I endure this sorrow
 Let my time come, let me die;
 If only I could find in my heart
 Such a Stranger as I.

O my helpless Yunus Emre,
 No remedy is found for my sorrow.
 Go wander from place to place,
 Find such a Stranger as I.

In the following poem he frankly admits he is tired of the world, yet accepts the burden of his restless heart as his portion in life:

Thou hast burned me. Thou hast set me on fire,
 What has happened to thee, O my heart, what has happened ?
 Thou hast made me grow tired of the world,
 What has happened to thee, O my heart, what has happened ?

Because Love has become thy guest,
 Offer thy soul as sacrifice to it.
 Thy task in life is to burn.
 What has happened to thee, O my heart, what has happened ?

The spirit of willingness for God's sake to accept his lot in life and not avoid its suffering cannot help but recall the words of Jesus, "He that doth not take up his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me."

HIS ETHICAL IDEAS

Yunus' search for God is closely associated with his ethical theories. Psychologically the ordinary man is aware of a duality (*ikilik*). The man feels himself different from God and from God's spirit. The way of the religious man involves an effort to do away with this feeling of duality and attain to a sense of oneness. The first step in the ethical process is overcoming any sense of shame or personal honor. There must be a complete forsaking of the world and of worldly things. One must come to see all things to be good and agreeable. Mystics who have attained to this degree of development do not pay attention to the differences that separate people into good and bad ; into Muslims, idolaters, etc. A test of attaining to this stage occurs when someone does you harm. If you are a true man of religion you will do him good in return, because you are above offense, and because you see in him the good and not the bad. The following lines show how

closely this ethical attitude approaches to Jesus' commandment to love even one's enemies :

Whoever throws a stone at me, let there be a rain of roses on him.
I would lean down and kiss the foot of him who would strike at me,
He who curses me, I would always pray for him.
He who would put out my light, may God cause his hearth to burn.

That such an ideal of completely overcoming all malice, all resentment against others was not easy for Yunus himself is shown in the following poem in which the word "dervish" stands for the man of true religion, and the "ocean" means the ocean of God's love.

The dervish way says to me :
You cannot be a dervish.
Come, let me say to thee :
You cannot be a dervish.

The dervish has a contrite heart,
His eyes are full of tears,
Milder than a sheep he is ;
You cannot be a dervish.

No hand against the beater,
No word against the curser,
The dervish is void of pride ;
You cannot be a dervish.

You rail with your tongue ;
You read many meanings ;
You look at what is, and what isn't ;
You cannot be a dervish.

Until you arrive at what is true ;
Until you attain your Teacher's side ;
Until God elects you for it ;
You cannot be a dervish.

O dervish Yunus, come now,
Make your plunge into the ocean ;
Until you plunge into the ocean ;
You cannot be a dervish.

HIS APPRECIATION OF NATURE

Travelling as Yunus did over the plains and through the forests of Asia Minor his poet's heart could respond with eager joy to the

beauties of nature, yet even in these moments it was spiritual meanings he saw :

Gone is the darkness of winter ; the spring has come with coquettish air ;
 New plants have sprung up ; all is merry with summer air.
 The meadow is green again ; the roses have come again,
 Fresh melodies are being composed with music on instrument fair ;
 Happy news has come from the Friend ; garden and vineyard are on the
 mend ;
 The nightingales a thousand epics utter, their secret sent forth on the air.
 Who has ever seen the owl as it enters into a rose garden ?
 The storks can never make mention (*zıkr*) with voice and agreeable air.
 If you conceal it for months, the pearl turns not to a diamond.
 Stork flies with stork, and falcon always with falcon soars in the air.
 The tame bird is held in the hand, the rose bird with roses stays ;
 The owl loves old ruins, the hawks prefer to float on the air.

To Yunus it is thus suggested that one needs a preparation of the soul in order to make the religious life possible. There is a law of nature by which some seem drawn toward this life. Until there is an adaptation of nature in the inner life the life hid in God makes no appeal.

HIS MUHAMMADANISM

Since Yunus' nature is one of such transparent faith, his love of God so real, it is natural to ask to what extent he is indebted to Muḥammad and to the formal religion of Islām for his religious experience. Several hymns are attributed to Yunus in which he sings praise of Muḥammad :

May my life be offered a sacrifice for his way ;
 His name is beautiful, he is beautiful, Muḥammad.
 Come, make intercession for thy humble slave ;
 His name is beautiful, he is beautiful, Muḥammad.

The sufferings of those who believe are many ;
 In the next world shall be joy and pleasure.
 The Mustafa of eighteen thousand worlds,
 His name is beautiful, he is beautiful, Muḥammad.

Without thee what good would two worlds do Yunus,
 Thou art the true prophet without shadow of doubt.
 Those who do not imitate thee are lacking in faith,
 His name is beautiful, he is beautiful, Muḥammad.

And yet Yunus is by no means a believer in the formal system of Islām. He usually treats the legal requirements of the religion with respect, and if the above poem can be accepted as authentic, there was a feeling approaching reverence almost for Muḥammad himself; but he finds salvation lying elsewhere than in outer rites and in formal ceremonies. In the following poem the word "religion" is used in its ordinary meaning as understood in Turkey even today, the external system of organization and of rules and requirements:

If you ask about religion and nation, what need have Lovers of religion?
The one who longs after God is mad with love; he knows nothing of
religion and religiosity.

The heart and soul of the Lover are close to the Loved One,
When separated, what can one do either with piety or obedience?

The following poem still more strongly contrasts the formal law with the mystic search for truth, and at the same time illustrates perhaps more comprehensively than any other Yunus' general ideas, for if I understand it aright, it includes his theory of procedure in religious propaganda, his basic ideals of honor and international goodwill, as conditions for one who would be a religious teacher, and his reliance on spiritual truth, by which he means experience of reality, rather than on formal observance of external law.

Speaking but little is the best way to speak,
For speaking can place a stain on the heart;
If you ask me to wipe away that stain,
I would urge telling the true heart of the matter.
To him who speaks truly, God says, Be a teller of Truth.
He who cannot look with equal favor on the seventy-two nations,
Though he be a great teacher of the people is a rebel against Truth.
Listen, as I tell lawfully the news of the Law (*Sheriat*):
The Law is a ship; Truth is its ocean.
However strong are the planks of that ship
With each buffeting of the waves they'll be shattered.
Hearken, O friends, to the real heart of this matter:
A saint of the Law may not be a believer in Truth.

HIS STRUGGLE FOR THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

A thing which endears Yunus Emre to sincere and earnest students of his poetry is the fact that victory in the spiritual life was

for him not easy. There was constant struggle. Life for him was intensely real. His heart responded to the whole gamut of human experience. In one of his very finest hymns, which more even than his other poems seems incapable of being rendered into English, he pleads that God may not take the life from his body until he has entered into full knowledge of the beloved. He prays for a gleam of light from God and he feels so strongly the stress of his unutterable longing that he wonders the very angels in heaven are not burned by the warmth of his prayer.

The following poem also, capable perhaps of being interpreted merely as an interesting way of expressing a pantheistic reflection, is more probably to be taken as a serious and deeply sincere study in variety of inner experience:

God has given me feelings ; one becomes quickly bewildered.
 Sometimes happiness comes, sometimes there is sorrow.
 Sometimes you would think it was winter, like the coldest part of winter ;
 Sometimes life is inspired by good news ; it is like a pleasant garden and
 vineyard ;
 Sometimes one can't speak ; one cannot explain a thing.
 Sometimes one is left in ignorance, one seems to know nothing.
 Sometimes one goes to the mosques and prostrates one's face on the ground ;
 Sometimes one goes to church, reads the Gospel, becomes a Christian ascetic.
 Sometimes, like Jesus, one causes the dead to rise.
 Sometimes one enters the house of pride, like Pharaoh and Haman.
 Sometimes one turns into Jebrail and scatters mercy on every gathering.
 Sometimes life seems abundant, poor Yunus becomes bewildered.

YUNUS AND THE GOSPEL

This poem raises directly the question as to how literally we can take the reference to the Gospel. Had Yunus actually read the story of Jesus? One Turkish student of his poetry is convinced that he had, and he asks what translation he could have seen. Passages already quoted show the spirit at least of some of Jesus' teaching. The following line is strongly reminiscent of Jesus' command to first make clean the inside of the cup that the outside may be clean also :

Before there is improvement within, what good is improvement without ?

HIS PARABLE POEM

The most famous poem of Yunus Emre is one of twelve double lines in each of which in parabolic language a separate generalization on life and practical philosophy is packed. Two lengthy commentaries have been written by Turkish writers on this single poem, the one by Niyazi Muḥammad al-Misri being printed on the margin of the 1340 lithographed edition of the *Divan*. Comment on this poem deserves a whole book. Here one cannot hope to more than barely mention two double lines in order to give an idea of Yunus' sincerity, the depth of his own experience, the extent of his observation of human nature, and his effectiveness as a teacher of religious truth. The poem, or discourse, begins with the following parable:

I climbed into the branches of the plum tree ; there I ate the grape,
The owner of the garden objecting says : Why do you eat the walnut ?

Niyazi al-Misri, in commenting on this line, compares the plum with the Sheriat, or formal religious law. Good without, it is inedible within. The grape he compares with the Tariḳat, or Mystic Way, a fruit good all through and with many uses, yet with inedible seeds. The walnut, he says, is Ḥaḳīkat or Truth in the sense of essential religious experience. The external shell is hard, and requires cracking in order to find the real meat within. In contrast to this classical explanation of the formal interpreter, Burhan Umit Bey finds the more simple and direct meaning in a reference to the confusion of mind of the poet's own youth, when in seeking for one value he finds another, only to learn that those who know its value better appraise it still differently.

Another verse of the discourse, like the others with its own meaning, apparently without connection with the lines before and after, is as follows:

A fly raised up an eagle, dashed it to the ground.
No lie, it's the truth. I myself have seen the dust of it.

To Niyazi this refers to the insignificant in the world's eyes overcoming in argument and knowledge the great of the world. Burhan Bey's more spiritual interpretation identifies the fly as vice, able to eat out the heart and destroy a man of great ability.

With this brief glimpse into the poet's mind and one of his methods of teaching, this brief study concludes. A poet of intense sincerity, and religious earnestness, circumscribed as far as the form of his work is concerned, but wide as humanity in his own experience and observation of life, and with a depth of thought that suggests the philosopher as well as the poet, Yunus Emre richly deserves the careful study that only years and the clash of deeply interested minds can make possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Divan of Yunus Emre*, lithograph edition Istanbul 1340
Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar, by Professor Köprülü Zade Fuat Bey Istanbul 1918
 This book gives an excellent bibliography of all books on the subject up to that date, and it contains a detailed, critical study of Yunus' life and work and later influence.
Yunus Emre, No. 6 of the Turkish Folk Lore Society's publications Istanbul 1929
Divan Edebiyatı Antolojisi XIII ve XIV uncu Asır Istanbul 1931
 "Yunusun Asil Adi," by Osman Nury Bey in *Millî Mejmua*, No. 129 November 1, 1931
 "Yunus Emreye Dair," by Burhan Umit Bey in *Edebiyat Gazetesi*, No. 3 July 7, 1932
Mevlüt Tevshihleri, published by Istanbul Konservatuvarı Istanbul 1931
 Contains a hymn reputedly by Yunus Emre together with notes.
Halk Bilgisi Haberleri, monthly magazine of the Folk Lore Society, Nos. 1 and 16 1929 and 1931

I am indebted to Burhan Umit Bey for the following list of *Divans* known to be available in Turkish libraries. The comments are Burhan Bey's.

1. In the library of the Department of Education in Ankara;

probably written in 1150. The contents of this *Divan* are more extensive than any other known to me. Although no date is directly indicated, from the writing and the paper it is judged to be written about 1150. It contains the *mesnevi* at the beginning. Counting this *mesnevi* there are 770 poems, each page has 34 lines. There are 109 sheets. By comparing it with other *Divans* it appears to be in some places ten per cent, in other places twenty per cent inaccurate and about four hundred of the poems probably are not Yunus' at all. It is doubtful if there are much over four hundred authentic poems of Yunus extant.

2. The *Divan* in the private library of Köprülü Zade Fuat Bey. Begins with the *mesnevi*, apparently written about A.H. 1200. Poems arranged in alphabetical order of rhymed syllables. Written by one hand from beginning to end, but no name of copyist or date given. In fairly good condition. About seven hundred poems.

3. The *Divan* in the Halis Effendi section of the University Library (4762); apparently written about A.H. 1300. Very new. Writing *talik* style; not arranged in order of rhyme. No date or name of copyist, numerous mistakes, contains about six hundred poems.

4. *Divan* in Ali Emiri Effendi Library (616) closely resembles No. 2. Not in very good condition. Arranged according to the letter of the syllable. Date and copyist unknown. Apparently written about one hundred and fifty years ago; numerous mistakes.

5. *Divan* in the Fatih Jami Library (3889). Judging from the writing and paper it was written about A.H. 850 to 900; no date given. Writing is *nesikh* style and very beautiful. Every line contains one hemistich, and at the end of each hemistich and the beginning of the second there are large gilt points. All the pages are illuminated. Written throughout by one hand in the same writing as is found in Turkish books beginning from 700. Besides the *mesnevi* there are only 203 other poems. Inaccuracies are found in a proportion of about five per cent.

6. Copy in the private library of Burhan Umit Bey. This *Divan* was written from 750 to 800 at the latest. The spelling is

throughout ancient style. Some letters are entirely lacking. Although it contains 65 more poems than the Fatih copy it has only 130 of the poems that are in the latter. Contains mistakes in proportion of about five per cent. There is no *mesnevi* at the beginning. No date and name of copyist given.

7. *Divan* in the Halit Effendi Suleymaniye Library (608) apparently written about A.H. 900. An accurate copy. The contents resemble those of the Fatih copy, although many pages have fallen out and been lost. There is no *mesnevi*.

8. Esat Effendi Suleymaniye Library. It forms one part of a collection and is short like the Fatih copy. Apparently written about 1000.

9. Nuri Osmaniye copy. This also forms a part of a collection. Bears the date 950 at the end. It is short like the Fatih copy. It contains the *mesnevi*.

10. Selim Nuzhet Bey's copy. Date and copyist unknown. Apparently written about one hundred years ago. Resembles the Fatih copy closely, but in places contains additional mistakes.

11. Copy in the Selim Aga Library in Scutari. New, written recently by Mumtaz Effendi. Rather complete.

12. Copy in Murat Molla Library in Charshamba. This can hardly be counted as a separate *Divan* because it is evidently copied from the Fatih copy.

13. Copy in Hajji Mahmut Effendi Library in the Yahya Effendi Dergyah in Beshiktash. This copy was written about A.H. 900 to 950. It is completely vowelled; an important copy.

PIERCE BUTLER

*Professor of Library Science, Graduate Library
School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois*

FIFTEENTH CENTURY EDITIONS OF ARABIC
AUTHORS IN LATIN TRANSLATION

FIFTEENTH CENTURY EDITIONS OF ARABIC AUTHORS IN LATIN TRANSLATION

By PIERCE BUTLER

NO HISTORICAL student of the culture of western Europe can ever reconstruct for himself the intellectual values of the later Middle Ages unless he possesses a vivid awareness of Islām looming in the background. For many centuries this other civilization had been at once a rival and a coadjutor to that of Christendom. Even before the days when the First Crusade was preached, the western mind had become conscious of Muslim warriors, Muslim genius, and Muslim enterprise in watchful investment of the three southerly gateways to the European continent. As the armed outposts of lesser Asia fell one by one, and as the frontiers in Sicily and along the Pyrenees crumbled, the earlier self-vaunting confidence on the Christian side necessarily dwindled and at moments sank to despair. But all this is duly recorded in our historical documents. It is not difficult for the modern reader in the western archives of that period to attain a competent understanding of the state of mind which pervaded Europe so long as Islām continued to be a formidable rival for the political and religious control of the continent. The concrete realities of military action establish their own significance.

The other aspect of Islām, face to face with Europe, is a matter of vastly less tangibility. As a matter of course, every student of history knows that Muslim scholarship contributed positively to the development of western culture, but he knows this usually only as a general truth and because competent authority has so stated it. He finds it extremely difficult to comprehend enough of the details to establish the generalization as a logical conclusion in his own mind. Indeed, no other chapter in the ordinary treatise on medieval culture is usually more impressive and less convincing than the one which endeavors to describe the function of Arabic scholars in transmitting to the later European mind a

knowledge of the philosophies and the sciences which ancient Greece and ancient India had long since developed.

No doubt the difficulty is due to the limitations which are inevitable in any attempt to demonstrate a general intellectual movement from the chance survival of particular manuscripts. Here the specialist who is familiar with a multitude of such isolated survivals may venture safely upon an induction, even though this may remain unconvincing to a lay reader of his conclusions. The latter is quite certain to be obsessed by a suspicion that each scrap of evidence, cited as typical, may, after all, be unique and extraordinary. So long as the multiplication of books depended upon individual transcriptions, the existence of even several copies of a particular text supplies no direct evidence of the extent to which it was actually current at the times when these manuscripts were written. But as soon as books were reproduced by the printing press positive evidence of their effective circulation becomes available. This is of three sorts:

(1) The mere fact that a particular book was selected for publication. The earlier printers followed their trade as a commercial enterprise. Out of all the various texts available in manuscript they chose the ones for which there was a ready market. Even when all due allowance is made for an occasional error of judgment, the books which were printed during the fifteenth century may be regarded as the living literature of the period. With an industry and an enthusiasm which has perhaps never been equalled since, these early craftsmen undertook to reproduce in printed copies, first of all, the older books of established reputation for which there was a constant demand, and then gradually, to issue newly written texts which might or might not attain a wide circulation.

(2) The multiplication of copies by the means of mechanical fabrication. It is fairly well established that the average number of copies in a fifteenth century edition was about two hundred. This in contrast with the single copy resulting from a manuscript reproduction established a high probability of a wide circle of readers.

(3) The appearance of successive editions. Since it is obvious that no printer would invest his capital to reissue a book of which he already possessed an unsalable stock, the bibliographical record of any particular text may be used as a quantitative index of its actual circulation.

Thus it would seem that the bibliographical history of the late fifteenth century might be used for evidence of the influence of Arabic books on the scholarship of western Europe. There is no definite proof that any books were printed in Arabic during that period, but, as any catalog of incunabula¹ will reveal, Latin translations or paraphrases of such books were abundant. The following list is presented merely as a sample of the kind of tangible evidence that can be drawn from bibliographical records. In a cursory examination of the first three volumes of the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*² the following translations from the Arabic were noted by one who possesses no knowledge of either the language or the literature of Muslim scholarship. Although these fifteenth century editions are comparatively late, such a list as this may throw a light back on the earlier periods, if it is remembered that the books enumerated were of established reputation and formed a part of traditional scholarship as it had been formed by the activities and interests of preceding generations.

ASTROLOGY

Alubather.

De nativitatibus. Venice, Aloysius, June 1, 1492.

The Arabic text from which this is translated has not been identified though the author is certainly Abū-Bakr al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Khaṣīb.

Albumasar.

(1) *De magnis conjunctionibus*. Augsburg, Ratdolt, March 31, 1489.

¹ A convenient list of these catalogs will be found in: R. A. Peddie, *Fifteenth Century Books: A Guide to their Identification*. London, 1913.

² *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*. Leipzig, 1925 ff. Five volumes (A-By) have so far been published.

- (2) *Flores astrologiae*. Augsburg, Ratdolt, November 18, 1488.

Other editions:

Augsburg, Ratdolt, September 14, 1495.

Venice, Sessa, c. 1500.

- (3) *Introductorium in astronomiam*. Augsburg, Ratdolt, February 7, 1489.

Of these (1) is the *Kitāb aḥkām sinī'l-marwālīd*, (2) apparently parts of (1), and (3) the *Kitāb al-madkhal ilā 'ilm aḥkām al-nujūm*, all by Abū-Ma'shar Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Balkhī, d. A.D. 886.

Alchabitius.

Libellus isagogicus. Mantua, Vurster, 1473.

Other editions:

Venice, Ratdolt, January 16, 1482.

Venice, Ratdolt, 1485.

Venice, de Gregoriis, July 26, 1491.

All of these editions reprint Johannes Hispalensis' translation of the *al-madkhal ilā sinā'at aḥkām al-nujūm*, of 'Abd-al-'Azīz ibn 'Uthmān ibn 'Alī al-Qabīṣī, fl. A.D. 950.

Alfraganus.

Compilatio astronomica. Ferrara, Belfortis, September 3, 1493.

The *Jawāmi' 'ilm al-nujūm wa'l-ḥarakāt al-samāwīya* of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Farghānī, fl. A.D. 840. This, like the previous work, is a Latin version made by Petrus Hispalensis, probably from the Arabic text.

PHILOSOPHY

Averroes.

- (1) *Destructiones destructionum philosophi Algazelis*. Venice, Locatellus, March 1, 1497.

- (2) *In meterologica Aristotelis*. Venice, Torresanus, August 21, 1488.

Of these (1) is a translation of the *Tahāfut al-tahāfut* of

Abū 'l-Walīd Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Rushd, d. 1198. The original form of (2) is uncertain.

Averroes' chief importance in the printed literature of the fifteenth century consists in his commentaries which were published with various Latin translations of Aristotle's works. Among these may be noted:

Aristoteles:

(1) *Opera*. Venice, Torresanus, 1483.

Other editions:

Venice, Torresanus, 1483 (a different edition).

Venice, Stagninus, 1489.

Venice, de Gregoriis, 1495.

(2) *Meteorologia*. Padua, Canozius, June 24, 1474.

(3) *Rhetorica*. Venice, Petri, June 22, 1481.

MEDICINE

Abulkasim.

Liber servitoris de praeparatione medicinorum simplicium.

Venice, Nicolaus Jenson, 1471.

Another edition. Naples, September 15, 1478, probably by Conrad Geldenmund.

This is a Latin version by Abraham Tortuosiensis, of a section of the *Kitāb al-taṣrīf li-man 'ajiza 'an al-ta'ālīf* of Abū'l-Qāsim Khalaf ibn 'Abbās al-Zahrāwī of Cordova (fl. A.D. 1005), apparently from the earlier Hebrew translation by Semtob ben Jishaq.

Avenzohar.

Abhorneron. Venice, de Gregoriis, January 4, 1491.

Other editions:

Venice, Locatellus, May 31, 1496.

Venice, de Luna, December 23, 1497.

An anonymous Latin translation of the Hebrew translation of Jacobus Hebraeus, of the pharmacopoeia of Abū Marwān 'Abd-al-Malik ibn Zuhr, of Seville (fl. A.D. 1090).

Avicenna.


- (1) *De anima*. Pavia, Carcanus, c. 1485.
- (2) *De animalibus*. Venice, de Gregoriis, c. 1500.
- (3) *Canon*. Strassburg, R-printer, before 1473.

Other editions:

- Milan, de Lavagna, February 12, 1473.
 - Padua, Herbort, 1476.
 - Padua, Herbort, 1479.
 - Pavia, Carcanus, 1482.
 - Venice, Maufer, 1483.
 - Venice, Maufer, 1486.
 - Venice, Bertochus, 1489.
 - Venice, Locatellus, March 24, 1490.
 - Venice, Bevilaqua, 1500.
- (4) *Canon*, with commentaries. Venice, de Tortis, 1491.
 - (5) *Canon*, separate books.
 - Book 1. Italy, unknown printer, December 23, 1472.
 - Book 4. Bologna, Harlem and Valbeck, April 11, 1482.
 - Books 1, 2, 4. Lyon, Trechsel, December 24, 1498.
 - (6) *Cantica*. Venice, Maufer, March 24, 1483.
 - (7) *Metaphysica*. Venice, Vitalibus, March 26, 1496.
- Latin versions (1, 2, 7) of *Kitāb al-shifā*; (3, 5) of *al-Qānūn fī l-ṭibb*; and (6) of *al-Arjūza*, by Abū-'Alī al-Ḥusain ibn 'Abdallāh ibn Sīnā, d. 1037. These, also, were translated from Hebrew renderings, by various pens. For the *Canon*, at least, the Hebrew translation was printed at Naples, November 9, 1491, in a large volume of 676 pages.

A NOTE ON THE EARLIEST PRINTING OF ARABIC

The earliest extant volume printed in Arabic characters seems to be the *Horologium*, produced at Fano by Gregorius de Gregoriis, in A.D. 1514 (Plate 1). The lost edition of the Qur'ān in Arabic, printed by de Paganinus, is variously dated by different writers—before 1499, not after 1509, 1510, 1518, and 1530.



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

صَلَاةُ السَّاعَةِ السَّارَّةِ =
هَلُمُّوا نَسْجِدُوا وَنَرْكِعُوا لِلْمَسِيحِ
مَلَكُنَا وَالْأَهْنَا الْمَزْمُورِ
التَّالِي وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ
بِأَمْرِكَ خَلَصْنِي وَبِقُوَّتِكَ
أَذْكُرُكَ يَا سَمِيعُ يَا اللَّهُ صَلَاتِي

From a dealer's catalog

PLATE I

Horologium, arabice. Fano, Gregorio de' Gregori, 1514

Sarraceni lingua et littera vtuntur Arabica hic inferius
 fu bimpzessa.

Dal	Dal	Keh	heh	Gym	Tech	Te	Be	Aleph
د	د	ك	ه	ج	ط	ت	ب	ا
Ayn	Saad	Ta	daad	Sad	G Gym	G Gym	Zaym	Re
ع	س	ط	د	س	ج	ج	ز	ر
hehe	nun	mym	lam	lann	capl	enbly	ffea	Saym
ه	ن	م	ل	ل	ك	ن	ف	س
و	ل	ع	ج	ح	ج	ج	ج	ج
وولstula m. pox	ye	lamalyx	mau					
ghml?	ب	خ	و					

i iii

From copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago

PLATE II

BERNHARD VON BREIDENBACH, *Peregrinatio in terram sanctam*. Speier, July 29, 1490

Apparently every discussion of this book, from Erpenius in 1620 to Sarton in 1927, is based ultimately on the single passage which occurs in the *Introductio in Chaldaicum linguam, Syriacam atque Armenicam* . . . of A. T. Albonesi, published at Pavia in 1539. Here Albonesi cites a letter written to him in 1537 by Guillaume Postel of Paris, which asked him to find out who had printed the Qur'ān, and, if possible, to buy for him the punches or matrices. Albonesi quotes his reply, of which the most significant passage for us is as follows: “. . . non cessavi Alessandrum Paganini Brixienis filium . . . rogare . . . ut typos . . . quibus olim pater eius Alcoranum impressavit . . . Postello . . . vendere . . . quod . . . iam facere . . . paratus [est].” In another passage Albonesi quotes from this edition: “. . . et caetera quae in quinto quinternione Alcorani typis impressi, folio antepenultimo sequuntur. . . .”

From this it seems certain that in 1537 Albonesi had access to a printed copy of the Qur'ān. It contained more than five gatherings of five sheets each and was therefore a volume of more than one hundred pages. Moreover, Alexander, the son of Paganinus, told Albonesi that his father had printed it and that the types were still in existence. But nothing is said of Venice as the place of printing, of the destruction of the whole edition, nor is the date given.

From other sources we know that four printers calling themselves de Paganinis were at work in Venice before the close of the fifteenth century:

- (1) Alexander de Paganinis printed one edition dated 1491.
- (2) Hieronymus de Paganinis, Brixienis, printed six editions, the earliest dated 1492, the latest, 1497.
- (3) Jacobus de Paganinis, Brixienis, printed five editions in 1490 and 1491.
- (4) Paganinus de Paganinis, Brixienis, printed thirty-one editions, the earliest dated 1485, the latest, 1499.

After 1500 Paganinus de Paganinis printed books at Venice between 1503 and 1518. In the latter year he established himself at Toscolano in partnership with his son Alexander and issued books

as late as 1523, and possibly later. It was undoubtedly this son Alexander that Albonesi knew, but his identity with the Alexander who had published the *Summa angelica* of Clavasio in 1491 is perhaps doubtful, for the latter does not call himself Brixienensis in his colophon. From 1485 to 1499 Paganinus had used a characteristic set of types and ornaments, but when he resumed his work in 1503 it was with new typographical material, namely, the letters that had been used by Hieronymus from 1492 to 1497. If the Arabic font had been in Paganinus' possession before 1499 it is very unlikely that his son would still have it in 1537. Thus all that we can say about the date of the Qur'ān is that it was probably after 1503 and before 1523. To assume on this slender basis that it preceded the Fano *Horologium* would seem somewhat rash.


The various literary historians who have attempted to date the book more closely have been dependent upon the bibliographical records available to them, and they have not always interpreted these records correctly. The last edition mentioned in an incunabula list does not always indicate the end of a printer's activity; he may have continued to work after the turn of the century. Thus Dr. Sarton in his *Introduction to the History of Science*, (Vol. I, p. 465), mentions a fifteenth century edition of the Qur'ān, citing as his authority Professor Carter, who in turn cites Dr. Grohman of Prague. The scholar last named has evidently confused the first Alexander with Paganinus and seems not to have known that the latter was printing as late as 1523.

The story that this first printed Qur'ān was burned by order of Pope Julius II seems to have no documentary basis. It apparently was developed by expanding the statement of Thomas Erpenius in his *Rudimenta Linguae Arabicae* of 1620, which says "Alcoranus Arabice circa annum 1530 literis Arabicis: sed exemplaria omnia cremata sunt." But we know that Albonesi, as late as 1537, had access to a copy.

Thus, no printing in Arabic script is known to have been produced during the fifteenth century except two fragments which possess antiquarian rather than historical interest. The first of

Sequuntur quedam cōmunia vocabula de ideommate sarracenco in latinum translata.

Caput	ras	Fulgur	barek	Alinus	hamar
Frons	lahala	Tomitruū	rad	Uacca	baccara
Trinis	Sbar	Brando	barath	Vinulus	hefel
Oculus	ayn	Plit	delf	Capra	anse
Auris	eden	Glacies	sihlith	Ovis	ganeme
Nasus	onff	Panis	chobif	Auca	zrofhe
Os	fom	Panis	corban	Anser	ocke
Labium	foffe	Carnes	lahem	Gallus	dic
Lingua	lesan	Casus	yibon	Gallina	refce
Dens	zcenn	Piscis	somck	Columba	hemame
Collum	angk	Auis	thayr	Canis	kepb
Buttur	mabla	pifa	hellie	canis	kolpb
Pectus	sodar	fabā	ful	leo	est
Lor	kalb	lens	addes	leo	sebey
Iccor	kodeth	ordcum	fayr	visus	dubbe
Pulmo	kebd	frumentum	chamebe	lepus	arnepb
Stomachus	bathān	pomum	doffaba	lupus	dijb
Venter	kref	pirum	engassa	catta	katt
Brachium	zende	ficus	thync	mus	fara
Manus	yd	angurij	bathich	mozs	maut
Digitus	zabeth	pulmentum	tabich	mortuus	meyet
Dorsus	daher	ouum	beyde	anima	neffiz
Latus	iomb	borrus	cnep	infirmus	gehcinnem
Crus	salgk	vinum	nebūd	Limiteriū	meysa
Genu	rocube	vas	ygrree	sepulchriū	caper
Tibia	kafbecl	fons	ayn	calix	caf
Pes	refle	aqua	moy	liber	keteb
Pedica	behim	cisterna	byr	altare	bukel
Planta	tatrefle	flumius	nabar	ducatus	ducat
Deus	alla	acetum	hall	denarius	denar
Angelus	melack	civitas	medine	medinus	medin
Sanctus	caddis	villa	dayan	tremus	terem
Diabolus	sagithan	castrum	carthe	flus	gelt
Rex	meleck	ecclesia	camisse	boium	syd
Dominus	arab	templum	hajkel	malum	farr
Domina	rabbe	domus	hajt	dulce	hellu
Nobilis	methesim	claustrum	bus	amarum	mozt
Rusticus	vellach	turris	barfo	pulchrum	cayef
Agricola	villach	fenestra	tacka	album	abijas
Sutor	esscheff	ianua	bab	nigrum	esuet
Sartor	bijath	via	trick	magister	mallein
Locus	tobach	molitor	daban	pistor	hesjan
Seruus	abijt	ancilla	ceryen	episcopus	osthopff b
Sacerdos	kebcm	sacrista	kandelocht	vir	rafol
Uulter	amara	pater	ebb	mater	omm
Filius	ebn	filia	bentht	frater	achb
Soror	oche	amicus	meheb	christianus	nazarani
Celum	hama	sol	schicmb	luna	kamar
Stella	nesime	nubis	gear	ventus	haurva



Sopra qualúque delle quale, di carattere Ionico. Romano. Hebræo.

these occurs in the successive editions³ of Bernhard von Breidenbach's *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam*. Here the Arabic alphabet is reproduced from a woodblock (not from type), and a glossary of 228 Arabic words, in transliteration, with their Latin equivalents, is also supplied. This book seems to have been extremely popular, largely, no doubt, because of its excellent reproductions of the drawings of Erhard Reuwich, who accompanied Breidenbach and his two companions, Graf Johann von Solm and Ritter Philipp von Becken, on their journey (April 1483-January 1484). At least eight editions of the narrative were published before the turn of the century: the Latin original, edited by Martin Roth (Mainz 1486, Speier 1490), translations into German (Mainz 1486, Augsburg 1488), Flemish (Mainz 1488), French (Lyon 1488), and Spanish (Saragosa 1498), as well as a French paraphrase by Nicolas Le Huen (Lyon 1489). A ninth, undated Speier edition in German is still counted by some bibliographers as an *incunabulum*, though most later authorities ascribe it to Peter Drach, about 1505. The work was frequently reissued during the sixteenth century and at least one later writer reprinted from it the Arabic-Latin vocabulary: the *Vocabula et interpretationes Grecorum et Hebraicorum una cum vocabulis communibus Saracenorum in Latinum translatis*, by Hermann Torrentinus, of which the earliest edition known to the present writer is that of Hagenau, 1507, in which it is appended to his *Elucidarius Carminum et Historiarum* which had already been published separately at Deventer in 1501.

The second fragment of fifteenth century printing in Arabic occurs in the woodblock on the recto of leaf h⁸ in the *Hypnerotomachia* of Franciscus Columna, printed by Aldus Manutius at Venice, in December 1499. Here an allegorical picture represents the hero with his companions approaching three closed doors at the base of a cliff. Above each portal is a trilingual inscription in Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin. The source from which Columna obtained his scraps of oriental learning has apparently never been traced.

³ Hugh William Davies, *Bernhard von Breydenbach and His Journey to the Holy Land, 1483-4*. London, 1911.

EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

*Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford Seminary
Foundation*

“AL-ABHARĪ’S ‘ĪSĀGHŪJĪ FĪ ‘L-MANṬIQ’ ”

AL-ABHARĪ'S "ĪSĀGHŪJĪ FĪ 'L-MANṬIḤ"

By EDWIN E. CALVERLEY

THE science of logic is of primary importance in Arabic studies. It is the introductory discipline for Muslim philosophy and theology. It provides the ideas, method, and vocabulary used in appraising the metaphysical sciences. One of its names in Arabic is *mi'yār al-'ulūm*, "the standard for measuring the sciences." Al-Ghazzālī recognized the practical necessity of logic for the defense and promotion of correct methods of thought and argument and prepared a number of books of his own on the subject, one of which he called *Mi'yār al-'ilm*.¹

Although logic is one of the subjects utterly condemned by the early theologians of the strict traditionist school, it has survived that antagonism.² Indeed, the "Collections of Texts," *Majmū'āt al-mutūn*, published frequently at Cairo for the use of theological students,³ include several texts on logic, and one of these is al-Abharī's *Īsāghūjī fī 'l-manṭiq*.

The title of al-Abharī's compendium is the same as that of Porphyry's "Introduction" to Aristotle's *Organon*, but, unlike Porphyry's work, al-Abharī's *Īsāghūjī* is not confined to a presentation of the Five Universals. It deals, although briefly, with all the nine divisions of logic.⁴

For western scholars the interest of the study of Arabian logic lies in the Muslim acceptance of the science from the Greeks and the adaptation of it to Muslim religious ideas.⁵ For western stu-

¹ Muḥammad al-Ghazzālī, *Maṭba'at Kurdistān al-'ilmīyah, Mi'yār al-'ilm fī fann al-manṭiq*, Cairo, 1329.

² I. Goldziher, *Stellung der alten islamischen Orthodoxie zu den antiken Wissenschaften*. Berlin, 1916, pp. 24 ff.

³ *ibid.*, p. 42.

⁴ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, art. "Isaghudji," Vol. II, p. 527; George Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* (Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1927), Vol. I, p. 335; *Liber Mafāṭih al-Olūm*, editio G. Van Vloten (Leiden, 1895), pp. 140 ff.

⁵ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, art. "Manṭiq," Vol. III, pp. 258 ff.

dents of religion the translation furnishes a brief review of the accepted logical method in Muslim scholasticism. For Arabists the vocabulary provides in English a considerable number of technical terms of logic which have not yet been included in western lexicons of Arabic.⁶ The importance of al-Abhari's *Īsāghūjī* is indicated not only by its inclusion in the "Collections of Texts," but also by the immense number of editions, commentaries and supercommentaries it has received.

Concerning al-Abhari himself Ibn Khallikān has the following notice: "In the year 625 [A.D. 1228] the Shaikh Athīr al-Dīn al-Mufaḍḍal al-Abheri, the author of the *Tālīka fī 'l-Khīlāf* [notes on controverted matters], the *Zīj* [astronomical tables], and other well known works, left Mosul and came to Arbela where we were then residing. He took up his lodgings in the Dār al-Ḥadīth [school for traditions], and I studied under his direction some controverted points of jurisprudence." He then relates several stories of al-Abhari's regard for his teacher Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Manā.⁷

Hājji Khalīfah adds still others to the list of al-Abhari's works given by Brockelmann.⁸ In Vol. I, p. 502, he states that the work on logic current in his time was that attributed to al-Abhari, and that the name "*Īsāghūjī*" was used by metonymy for the whole subject. He explains the name as a Greek word meaning the Five Universals, i.e. genus, species, difference, property, and accident. Porphyry's *Εἰσαγωγή* consists of the definition of these terms and the description of their interrelations. Among the MSS. in the Library of the Hartford Seminary Foundation is the *Commentary* of Khair al-Dīn⁹ on al-Abhari's *Īsāghūjī*. In this the title is said to be a Syriac expression for the Five Universals. Two views are given to account for the naming of the book. One view is that

⁶ Some of these terms are not found in the most extensive of the special vocabularies of philosophical Arabic, M. Horten, *Die Spekulative und Positive Theologie des Islams* (Leipzig, 1912).

⁷ Ibn Khallikān's "*Biographical Dictionary*," translated from the Arabic by MacGuckin de Slane (Paris, 1843-1871), Vol. III, pp. 468 f.

⁸ C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (Weimar, 1898, 1892), Vol. I, pp. 464 f.; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, art. "Barhebraeus," Vol. I, p. 658; Sarton, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 867.

⁹ Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 465, n. 3.

the title is the proper name of the philosopher who elucidated the Universals and composed a work about them. The other view is that it is the name of a person in whose charge one of the early philosophers left the work. That person used to speculate about the meaning of the terms, but was unable to understand their meaning. When the philosopher returned, that person read with him, and the philosopher kept addressing him during the lesson and saying, "O Īsāghūjī, this is it!" He repeated this time and again, so that it became the title of the work! The same interpretations are given also in two MS. copies of the *Commentary* of Zakarīyah al-Anṣārī,¹⁰ although there the correct explanation that the word means *madkhal*, or "Introduction," is also given.

It is worth while to note that, although the commentaries are inaccurate and uncertain when dealing with al-Abharī's title, they are clear and helpful when they deal with the text itself.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge indebtedness to Dr. Joshua Finkel for a number of helpful suggestions.

I. ĪSĀGHŪJĪ FĪ 'L-MANTIQ

Athīr al-Dīn Muḥaḍḍal bin 'Umar al-Abharī

This is a tractate on logic in which we have set forth what should be presented to beginners in any of the sciences.

A predicable (*lafẓ dāll*) designates its subject (a) wholly, by apposition (*muṭābaqah*), or (b) partially, if it be something that has a part, by inclusion (*taḍammun*), or (c) it designates what is associated with it in the mind by necessary inference (*iltizām*). Thus the word "man" designates (a) "rational animal" by apposition; or (b) one [species] of the two [species, i.e. that which reasons and that which is animal] by being included [in both]; or (c) one capable of [acquiring] knowledge and the art of writing, by necessary inference, as "man" [implies "being capable of those qualities" and vice versa].

The expression [*lafẓ*, i.e. the predicable] may be (a) singular (*mufrad*), as, "the man," where a part of the expression does not

¹⁰ Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 465, n. 5.

indicate a part of its meaning;¹¹ or (b) compound (*mu'allaf*), as "the thrower of stones" [where each element has its own part in the meaning of the expression].

A singular (*mufrad* [expression or term]) may be (a) universal (*kullī*), i.e. the primary mental image of its meaning (*naḥṣu taṣawwuri mafhūmihī*) does not exclude the occurrence of participation (*sharikah*) in regard to it;¹² or (b) particular (*juz'ī*), where the primary mental image of its meaning [as contrasted with what may be understood by deduction] excludes the term from universal application, as the word "Zaid" used as a proper noun.

A universal may be (a) essential (*dhātī*), i.e. apply to the specific nature (*ḥaqīqah*) of the particulars (*juz'īyāt*) of which it is constituted, as "animal" [is the universal, essential expression] in [relation to the two species to which] "man" and "horse" [belong]; or (b) it is accidental (*aradī*), which is just the opposite,¹³ as "risible" [is an accident] in respect of "man."

An essential expression (*al-dhātī*) is a predicament (*maqūl*) answering the question "What is it?" (a) in reference only to what is common [to two or more things], as "animal" in relation to "man" and "horse." This is called Genus (*al-jins*), which may be described (*yursamu*) as the universal that is predicated of many things differing in their species (specific natures, *ḥaqā'iq*) in answer to the question, "What is it?"

What is predicated in answer to the question, "What is it?" (b) when this question has reference both to what is common and what is individual (special, *al-khuṣṣiyah*), as "man" with reference to individuals (*afrād*), such as Zaid and 'Amr, is Species (*naw'*). Species may be described as the universal predicament applying to many differing in number, but not in specific nature, in answer to the question, "What is it?"

¹¹ In grammar, each part of a single expression, whether article, or vowel of inflexion, or, in the case of a verb, each vowel and servile letter, has its part in indicating the full meaning of the expression.

¹² This is the usual technical way of saying that what is immediately understood by the expression "man" is universally applicable to man as a genus.

¹³ That is, it does not refer to the essential nature.

The predicament that does not apply to the question, "What is it?" but rather (c) to the question, "What [kind of a thing] is it in itself?" (*aiyu shay'ūn huwa fī dhātihī*) and differentiates it from the things that share with it in genus,¹⁴ is Difference (*al-faṣl*), as "rational" in reference to man. Difference may be described as the universal predicament applied to a thing in answer to the question, "What is it in itself?"

An accident (*al-'araḍī*) may be (1) one whose separability (*infikāk*) from its substance (*al-māhīyah*) is excluded, which is the inseparable accident (*al-'araḍ al-lāzīm*), or (2) [one whose separability is] not excluded, which is the separable accident (*al-'araḍ al-mufāriq*).

Each of these two [kinds of accidents has two subdivisions]. (d) The first belongs to one species, in which case it is the specific accident or Property (*al-khāṣṣah*), as "risible" is a potentiality (*al-qūwah*) and action (*al-fi'l*) of man. It is described as the universal which is predicated of what comes under one species only as an accidental predicament (*qawl 'araḍī*). (e) The second may be common to more than one species. This is the accident in common (*al-'araḍ al-'āmm*), as "breathing in air" is a potentiality and action in reference to man and others of the genus "animal." It is described as the universal predicament that is applied to what comes under differing species as an accident.

II. DEFINITION (*AL-QAWL AL-SHĀRIḤ*)

A definition is a term designating what a thing is (*al-ḥaddu qawl^{un} dāll^{un} 'alā māhīyati 'l-shay'i*). It may be composed (*yatarakkabu*) of the proximate genus (*al-jins al-qarīb*) and the proximate difference (*al-faṣl al-qarīb*) of the thing, as "rational animal" in reference to man. This is the perfect definition (*al-ḥadd al-tāmm*). The imperfect definition (*al-ḥadd al-nāqis*) is composed of the thing's remote genus (*al-jins al-ba'īd*) and its proximate difference, as "rational body" with reference to man. It may be a perfect description (*al-rasm al-tāmm*), which is composed of the thing's proximate genus and its inseparable specific accidents or properties (*al-khawāṣṣ al-lāzimah*), as "risi-

¹⁴ That is, belong to the same genus.

ble animal" in defining (*ta'rīf*) man. The imperfect description is composed of accidents, the whole combination of which [but not each component part] belongs specifically to one species, e.g. what we say in defining man as "walking upon two feet, having broad finger-nails and a clear skin, standing erect and very risible by nature."

III. PROPOSITIONS (*AL-QADĀYĀ*)

A proposition is a sentence (*qawl*) of which it is valid to say that the one uttering it is telling the truth or lying. It may be either (a) categorical (*ḥamlīyah*), as "Zaid is a writer"; or (b1) it may be conjunctive hypothetical (conditional, *sharṭīyah muttaṣilah*), or (b2) it may be disjunctive hypothetical (i.e. alternative, *sharṭīyah munfaṣilah*), as "A number is either even or odd."

The first term of the categorical [proposition] is called the subject (*mawḍūʿ*), and the second is called the predicate (*maḥmūl*). The first term of the hypothetical is called the antecedent (*muqaddam*), and the second is called the consequent (*tālī*).

A proposition is either positive (*mūjabah*), as "Zaid is a writer," or negative (*sālībah*), as "Zaid is not a writer." Each of them [i.e. the positive and the negative] is either individual (*makhṣūṣah*), as we have just mentioned [in the example, "Zaid is a writer"], or it is universal with its sign (*kullīyah musawwarah*), as "Every man is a writer" and "No man is a writer"; or it is particular with its sign (*juzʿīyah musawwarah*), as "Some men are writers," and "Some men are not writers"; or it is not of these varieties but is indefinite (*muhmalah*), as "Man is a writer," and "Man is not a writer."

The conjunctive hypothetical proposition may be either (a) necessary (*lazūmīyah*), as "If the sun has risen, day has appeared," or (b) it may be coordinate (*ittifāqīyah*), as "If men are speakers, then donkeys are brayers."

The disjunctive hypothetical proposition may be inherent (*ḥaqīqīyah*, natural [some of the English logicians use the term "necessary" for this class of propositions]); i.e. both incompatible and non-exclusive (*māniʿatu ʿl-jamʿi wa ʿl-khulūʿi*), as "A

number is either even or odd"; or incompatible in affirmation only [i.e. excludes coexistence] (*māni'atu 'l-jam'i*), as "This thing is either a tree or a stone"; or non-exclusive (*māni'atu 'l-khulūwī* [i.e. valid only when negative antecedent is true or positive consequent is true]), as "Zaid is either at sea or he will not be drowned." The disjunctive hypothetical proposition may also be compound (*dhātu ajzā'm*), as "The number is more or less or equal."

IV. OPPOSITION (*AL-TANĀQUD*)

Opposition is the difference of two propositions in affirmation (*al-ījāb*) and negation (*al-salb*), wherein it is required that the essence (*al-dhāt*) [in distinction from the form] of one of them be affirmative and the other negative, as "Zaid is a writer; Zaid is not a writer." This is not valid (*lā yatahaqqaqu*) unless both propositions are congruous (*ittifāq*) in subject, and predicate, in time, place, relationship (*al-idāfah*), potentiality and action, in particular, universal and condition (*al-shart*), as "Zaid is a writer; Zaid is not a writer." The contradictory (*al-naqīḍ*) of an affirmative universal is a negative particular, as "Man is animal; some men are not animals." The only contradictory of a negative universal is an affirmative particular, as "No man is animal"; and "Some men are animal." Opposition is not valid in the case of the two universal and particular propositions (*al-mahṣūratān*)¹⁵ unless there is expressed a difference in quantity (*al-kammīyah*), because the two universals [i.e. the positive and the negative] may be false, as "Every man is a writer," and "No man is a writer," while the two particulars may be true, as "Some men are writers," and "Some men are not writers."

V. CONVERSION (*AL-'AKS*)

Conversion occurs when the subject becomes the predicate and the predicate becomes the subject, while the negative and positive remain the same and the truth (*al-taṣdīq*) and falsity (*al-takdhīb*) [of the statements] remain the same. The universal affirmative may not be converted (*tan'akisū*) into a universal,

¹⁵ These are the propositions, positive and negative, with their respective distributive or undistributive signs of "all," "every" or "none" and "some."

since the proposition (*qawī*) is true, "Every man is an animal," while it is not true that "Every animal is a man." But it may be converted into a particular, because when we say, "Every man is an animal," it is true to say, "Some animals are men," for we find something to be described in both animals and men, so that some animals are men.¹⁶

The particular affirmative may also be converted into a particular by the same argument (*al-ḥujjah*). The universal negative may be converted into a universal negative, and that is self-evident, because, when it is true, e.g. that "No man is a stone," it is true that "No stone is a man." The negative particular has no converse (*'aks*), of necessity (*luzūm^{an}*), for it is true that "Some animals are not men," and the converse of it is not true.

VI. SYLLOGISM (*AL-QIYĀS*)

A syllogism is a proposition (*qawī*) expressed (*malfūz*) or understood (*ma'qūl*), composed of such propositions that when they are granted (*sullimat*) they of themselves necessitate the validity of another proposition. The syllogism may be either (a) connective (*iqṭirānī*, i.e. categorical) as, "Every body is compound, and every compound is originated (*ḥādith*), so every body is originated." Or it may be (b) exceptive (*istithnā'ī*, i.e. hypothetical), as, "If the sun has risen, day has come; but day has not come, so the sun has not risen."

The repeated term (*al-mukarrar*) of the two premises (*al-muqaddimah*) of the syllogism is called the middle term (*ḥadd awṣaf*). The subject of the conclusion (*al-maṭlūb*) is called the minor term (*ḥadd aṣghar*), and its predicate is called the major term (*ḥadd akbar*). The premise which has the minor term is called the minor premise (*muqaddimah ṣughrā*). The one with the major term is called the major premise (*muqaddimah kubrā*). The form of the arrangement (*ḥa'atu 'l-ta'līfi*) is called the figure (*al-shakl*). There are four figures. If the middle term is predicate in the minor premise and is the subject in the major, this is the first figure. If it is the converse of that, it is the fourth

¹⁶ This is conversion *per accidens*.

figure. If it is the subject of both, it is the third figure. If it is the predicate of both, it is the second figure.

The second figure is transformed (*yartaddu*, i.e. reduced) to the first by converting the major premise. The third is reduced by converting the minor premise. The fourth is reduced to it by transposing the order (*bi'aksi 'l-tartīb*), or by converting the two premises together.

The perfect figure (*al-kāmil*), whose inference (*al-intāj*) is obvious, is the first. The fourth is very awkward (*ba'īd^{un} 'ani 'l-ṭab'ī*). One whose nature is normal (*ṭab' mustaqīm*) and whose mind is sound (*'aql salīm*) has no need to reduce (*radd*) the second to the first. The second provides a valid inference only when its two premises differ in affirmation and negation.

The first figure is the one which is made the gauge (*mi'yār*) for the sciences, so we will present it here, so that it may be taken as a model (*dustūr*), in order that all the conclusions may be inferred from it. The condition (*al-shart*) of its giving a valid inference is that its minor premise be affirmative and its major premise be universal. There are four useful moods (*al-ḍurūb al-muntijah*):

1. Every body is compound; every compound is originated (*muḥḍath*); so every body is originated. (This is Barbara.)
2. Every body is compound; no compound is eternal (*qadīm*); no body is eternal. (Celarent.)
3. Some bodies are compound; every compound is originated; so some bodies are originated. (Darii.)
4. Some bodies are originated; no compound is eternal; so some bodies are not eternal. (Ferio.)

The connective or simple syllogism (*al-qiyās al-iqtirānī*) is composed of two categorical propositions, as we have seen, or of two conjunctive hypotheticals, as "If the sun has appeared, day has come, and whenever day has come, the earth is lightened," so the inference is valid, "If the sun has appeared, the earth is lightened." Or it may be composed of two disjunctive hypotheticals, as "Every number is either even or odd, and every even number is either double an even number or double an odd number; therefore, every number is either odd, or double an even number or double an odd number."

In the exceptive or compound syllogism (*al-istithnā'*), the contrary of the consequent (*naqīḍu 'l-tālī*) validates the inference of the contrary of the antecedent (*al-muqaddam*), as, "If this is a man, then he is an animal; but this is not an animal, so it is not a man." If it is an inherent (necessary) disjunctive (*munfaṣilah haqīqīyah*), then the hypothesis (*istithnā'*) of the truth (*'ain*) of one of the two parts validates the inference of the contrary of the other, as "A number is either even or odd; it is even, therefore it is not odd," or, "it is odd, therefore it is not even." Likewise, the hypothesis of the contrary of the one validates the inference of the truth of the other.

VII. DEMONSTRATION (*AL-BURHĀN*)

1. Demonstration is argument (*qiyās*) composed of premises that are certain (*yaqīnīyah*), for the valid inference of other certainties. The certain truths (*al-yaqīnīyāt*) have [six] divisions: (a) The first are axiomatic (*al-awwalīyāt*), as, "One is half of two," and "The whole is greater than the part." (b) Perceptive (*al-mushāhadāt*), as, "The sun is a shining [body]," and "Fire burns." (c) Experimental (*al-mujarrabāt*), as, "Scammony is a purgative for bile." (d) Conjectural (*al-ḥadsīyāt*), as, "The light of the moon is reflected from the light [of the sun]." (e) Traditional (*al-mutawātīrāt*),¹⁷ as, "Muḥammad claimed prophethood and miracles appeared from him." (f) [Self-evident] propositions, whose arguments (*qiyāsātuhā*) accompany them, as, "Four is even," on account of the reason present in the mind, which is its divisibility into two equal parts.

2. Dialectic (*al-jadal*): this is argument (inference, *qiyās*) composed of premises known or¹⁸ conceded (*musallamah*)¹⁹ among men, or by the two disputants, as "Justice is good and oppression is evil."

3. Rhetorical (*al-khaṭābah*): this is argument composed of premises received from some person believed in, or presumed.

¹⁷ These traditions are of a special character: they represent the united testimony of many witnesses, and this quality gives them their authority.

¹⁸ The *Collections of Texts* of Cairo dated 1323, 1340, and 1347 all print *lā* for *aw*, but our MSS. copies have the correct reading.

¹⁹ The Cairo 1340 edition incorrectly reads *musallimah*.

4. Poetical (*al-shi'r*): this is argument composed of premises, acceptable and imagined, by which the soul is pleased or grieved.

5. Sophistical (*al-mughālaṭah*): this is argument composed of false premises, resembling what is real, or of what is commonly accepted, or of premises based on false supposition.

Reliance (*al-'umdah*) may be placed upon demonstration only.

DWIGHT M. DONALDSON
AL-YA'QŪBĪ'S CHAPTER ABOUT
JESUS CHRIST

(Translated from the *Ta'riḫh*, edited by Houtsma,
Vol. I, pp. 74-89)

AL-YA'QŪBĪ'S CHAPTER ABOUT JESUS CHRIST

(Translated from the *Ta'rīkh*, edited by Houtsma,
Vol. I, pp. 74-89)

By DWIGHT M. DONALDSON

INTRODUCTION

IF MUHAMMAD could have learned as much about the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles in the beginning of the seventh century as al-Ya'qūbī learned in the latter half of the ninth century, what a vast difference there might have been in world history! Unfortunately, however, the learning of al-Ya'qūbī, the earliest Shī'ite historian, was hampered by his belief in the authoritative inspiration of his Prophet. He was baffled by contradictions that he found between the accounts of Jesus in the Gospels and what he had read from the Qur'ān. Nevertheless, his scholarly instincts forbade that he should advance hypothetical explanations for these discrepancies, or that he should evade them by verbal subterfuge.

Originally from Khorāsān in far eastern Persia, he made journeys to India, Egypt, and Morocco. His geographical work, the *Kitāb al-Buldān*, has been especially valuable for the details it furnishes for the ancient highroads in 'Iraq. His *Ta'rīkh* (History) is in two volumes (edited by Houtsma, 1883). The first volume deals with pre-Islāmic times, with eighty-nine pages devoted to the prophets and patriarchs, from Adam to Jesus, followed by lists of kings—Assyrian, Babylonian, and Indian; then there are sixty pages on Greek philosophy, with a review of the times of Alexander, and lists of the rulers of the Byzantine and Persian empires, with brief mention also of Egypt, the Berbers, the Sudan, Arabia, and Syria; finally there are fifty pages on the descendants of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, with additional chapters on rulers, divinations, poets and tribal divisions of the Arabs.

The second volume begins with the life of Muḥammad, which is written from the author's distinctly Shī'ite point of view, and which is followed by a history of the Khalīfas, and likewise of the Shī'ite Imāms, up to A.D. 872. Al-Ya'qūbī died but nineteen years later. The value of his work, enhanced by his conciseness and his wide observation, is strikingly evident when we realize that he was contemporary with "the six" compilers of Sunnite traditions, and that his "History" was about twenty-five years earlier than the first of "the four" books of Shī'ite traditions.

What follows is a translation of his chapter on Jesus Christ, which he compiled from the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. It is read with additional interest when one recalls that it was written more than two hundred years before the First Crusade.

AL-MASĪḤ, 'ISĀ BIN MARYAM

Ḥannah was the wife of 'Imrān.¹ She took an oath [Qur. iii: 31], that if Allāh should give her a child, she would commit it to him. When she gave birth to Maryam, she gave her therefore to Zakarīyā' bin Barakhīyā bin Yīshū [perhaps Iddo] bin Naḥrā'il bin Sahlūn bin Arsū bin Shawīl bin Ya'ūd [?] bin Mūsā bin 'Imrān. He was a priest of the altar and held this position until, when she completed seventeen years, Allāh sent to her the angel, to give her a child that would be righteous. Of information about her there is that which Allāh, who is exalted and magnified, has related, up to the time when she became pregnant. Then, when her days were completed, the pains of labor visited her, as Allāh has said [Qur. xix: 23]. He [Allāh] has also described her condition and the condition of her son and what he said "from under her" [Qur. xix: 24], and also what he said in the cradle [Qur. xix: 31-34]. His birth was in a village called Bait Laḥm, in the province of Filastīn, and that [his birth] was on Tuesday of the twenty-fourth day of December.

¹ "The 'Imrān mentioned in the Qur'ān (sūra iii: 31), whose wife dedicated the fruit of her womb to Allāh, is not identical with the Biblical 'Amrām or 'Imrān. *Tha'labī* (p. 220) expressly mentions this, with the note that there was an interval of 1800 years between the two bearers of this name." (*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, art. "'Imrān," Vol. II, p. 476).

Māshā'allah, the astronomer,² said, "The horoscope of the year in which al-Masīḥ was born was: The Scales were at eighteen degrees; Jupiter was in the direction of Virgo, thirty-one minutes returning; Saturn was at the sign of the Kid, sixteen degrees and twenty-eight minutes; the Sun was at the sign of the Ram, one minute; Venus was at the sign of the Bull, fourteen degrees; Mars was at the sign of the Twins, twenty-one degrees and forty-four minutes; and Mercury was at the sign of the Ram, four degrees and seventeen minutes."

The people of the Injīl do not say that 'Īsā spoke in the cradle. They affirm, however, that Maryam was betrothed to a man named Yūsuf, who was of the line of Dā'ūd, that she became pregnant, and when the time of her delivery was near, he took her to Bait Laḥm. When she brought forth her child, he took her back to Nāṣarah of the mountain of al-Jalīl.³ On the eighth day he circumcised the child, according to the custom of Mūsā bin 'Imrān.

The apostles (*al-Ḥawārīyūn*) have given information about al-Masīḥ, and have described his life. We have examined their writings, one by one, and have noted what they have said about him. There were twelve apostles from tribes of Ya'qūb. Shim'un bin Kan'ān was from the tribe of ——— and Ya'qūb bin Zabdā ——— and Yaḥyā bin Ḥābir bin Fālī from the tribe of Zablūn, and Filifūs from the tribe of Ashar and Mattā from the tribe of Ashshajar bin Ya'qūb, and Sam'ā from the tribe of Harām bin Ya'qūb, and Yahūdā from the tribe of Yahūdā bin Ya'qūb, and Ya'qūb from the tribe of Yūsuf bin Ya'qūb and Manasā of the tribe of Rūbīl bin Ya'qūb. In addition to these there were seventy men. The four who wrote the Injīl were Mattā, Marqus, Lūqā and Yūḥanā,—two of whom were from the twelve and two others.

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

In the Injīl Mattā has said concerning the lineage (*nasab*) of al-Masīḥ: "Aisū' bin Dā'ūd bin Ibrāhīm" on down until after

² *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. III, p. 390.

³ A similar reference to *jabal al-Jalīl* is found in a poem cited in the *Tabaqāt of Ibn Sa'd*, IV, ii, 95 (12).

forty-two generations he ended at "Yūsuf bin Ya'qūb bin Māthan." Then he said: "Yūsuf was the husband of Maryam, and al-Masīḥ was born in Bait Laḥm of the villages of Filasṭīn, and the ruler of Filasṭīn in those days was Hairūdis. A party of the Magi (*al-majūs*) came to Bait Laḥm, and a star was over their heads, by which they were guided until they saw him [the child]; then they prostrated to him. Hairūdis, the ruler of Filasṭīn, wanted to kill al-Masīḥ, but Yūsuf took him and his mother to the land of Egypt. When Hairūdis died, he brought him back and made a home for him in Nāṣarah of the mountain of al-Jalīl."

[Mattā says also]: "When al-Masīḥ was grown and was twenty-nine years of age, he went to Yaḥyā bin Zakariyā' for training (*liyaṣṭani'ahu*), but Yaḥyā bin Zakariyā' said to him, 'I have more need of you than you have of me.'⁴ Al-Masīḥ replied, 'Abandon this saying, for so it is obligatory that righteousness be fulfilled.' Yaḥyā therefore gave up his objection."

Aisū' withdrew afterwards by the help of the Spirit of Allāh to the desert and fasted for forty days. Then Shaiṭān approached him and said, "If you are now the son of God, command these stones to become bread." Aisū' answered, "It is not only by bread that man is to live, but by the word of God." Shaiṭān took him then and put him upon a pinnacle of the temple and said to him, "Then cast yourself to the ground, for surely if you are the son of God his angels will watch over you." But al-Masīḥ said, "Verily, it is written, 'Do not tempt God with thyself.'" He said then to Shaiṭān, "Go, for to God I prostrate and him I worship." At this Shaiṭān left him and disappeared. Then the angels of Allāh came to al-Masīḥ and began to serve him. It was then that his disciples came to him and he began to speak to them in parables and by inspiration; also in other ways than in parables.

The first of the Injīl that he said, according to the Gospel of Mattā, was, "Blessed are the poor whose hearts are content with what is with their Lord, because theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the hungry who thirst for obedience to Allāh. Blessed are the truthful in speech, who give up falsehood, who are indeed

⁴ It would be interesting to know why the word indicating baptism was discarded in favor of one signifying religious education.

the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Thou shalt not kill,—in fact, thou shalt not even be angry with anyone at all; rather, strive to please whoever is angry with you, and make peace with your adversary. Do not commit adultery and do not look at other than your own women. If your right eye urges you to deceit, then pluck it out in order to save your body. Do not divorce your women for any other cause than adultery. Do not swear by Allāh, either truthfully or falsely, nor by his heavens nor by his earth. Do not resist evil, but whoever strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the left one. Whoever desires to take away your shirt, give him your cloak also. Whoever compels you to go with him a mile, go with him two miles. Whoever asks of you, give to him. Whoever would borrow from you, lend to him and do not refuse him. You have heard that it has been said, 'Love your friend and hate your enemy'; but for my part, verily I say unto you, 'Love your enemies, treat amicably the one who upbraids you, and do good to the one who hates you.' If you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not display your alms before men. Do not let your left hands know what your right hands do. Do not confront men in your prayers, but when you pray, enter your houses and close your doors, and let no one hear you. When you pray, say, 'Our Father who art in heaven; Thy name be sanctified; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us today sufficient bread for us; allow to us what we owe, as we allow to our debtors; and do not lead us into temptation, O Lord, but save us from the evil.'

"Do not display your fasts before men when you fast to Allāh your Lord, and do not alter your countenances, so that men may observe you, for surely your Lord knows your state. Do not lay up treasures where moth and rust corrupt, and where thieves dig through, but let your treasures be with your Lord who is in heaven, where moth does not injure and where thief does not steal. Do not be anxious about your livelihood, nor what you shall eat, nor what you shall drink, nor what you shall wear. Observe the birds in the sky, they do not sow, neither do they reap nor store away in houses, for Allāh surely provides for them, and you are more precious in the sight of Allāh than birds. Do not be

anxious about your children, for they are like you: as you were created, so they are created, and as you are sustained, so they are sustained. Do not say to your brother, 'Take out the mote from your eye,' while in your eye there is the trunk of a palm tree. Do not observe the faults of others, and leave alone your own faults. Do not give that which is holy, nor pearls, to swine to trample under their feet. Ask your Lord and he will give you; and fix your desire upon him: you will find him merciful toward you. Knock at his door and it shall be opened to you. For broad is the gate and evident is the way that leads men to destruction, but how small is the gate and narrow is the way that leads men to salvation! Beware of false men who are like hungry wolves. As you are not able to pluck grapes from thistles nor figs from the colycinth, so you do not find an evil tree which gives good fruit, nor a good tree which gives evil fruit. Every one who hears my word and then understands it is like a thoughtful man who built his house on a firm and hard place and the rain came and the rivers burst forth and the wind rose . . . and then the house fell."⁵

At this time Hairūdis was the ruler. He had seized Yūḥanā and imprisoned him. This was because he went in to the wife of his brother Filifūs, but Yūḥanā had forbidden him. Hairūdis wanted to kill him, but he was afraid because people greatly honored Yūḥanā. Then his brother's wife said to him, "Kill Yūḥanā," so he sent to the prison and had his head cut off and placed on a tray. Yūḥanā's disciples came and took the body and buried it. Then they came to al-Masīḥ and told him, and he withdrew into the barren desert, and he began to instruct his companions that they should not tell anyone.⁶

THE GOSPEL OF MARK

Marqus said in the beginning of his Injīl, "Aisū' al-Masīḥ was the son of Allāh. As it is written in Ish'ayā the prophet, 'Behold,

⁵ At this point the text is imperfect. Probably there has been a copyist's error in omitting the negative statement (Matt. vii: 26-27).

⁶ It will be observed that the latter part of these notes on the Gospel of Matthew is badly confused, and with the exception of the reference to the killing of John the Baptist, there is no mention at this point of the contents of Chapters VIII-XXVIII.

I am sending my angel before thy face to prepare thy way,'” Yahyā⁷ bin Zakariyā' administered the baptism for repentance. His clothing was of camel's hair and he bound his loins with a girdle (*gharfah*) of leathers. Then al-Masīḥ came to him from Nāsarāh of al-Jalīl for Yahyā to baptize him in the Jordan, and when he baptized him, the Holy Spirit came forth (*kharajat rūḥu 'l-quḍus*) upon the water like a dove, and a voice from the sky called from the sky, “You are my intimate son (*ibnī khalīlī*), in whom I rejoice.” Then he departed towards the mountain of al-Jalīl. And there were a number of men fishing, among whom were Shim'ūn and Andarāwus, and he said to them, “Join with me and I will make both of you to fish for men.” So they went with him and entered a village, and he healed the sick and the lepers and opened the eyes of the blind in it, and people gathered about him. So he began to speak to them in parables, and by divine inspiration, and to say, “Verily, I say unto you, This people (*al-qabīlah*) shall not pass away until the heavens and the earth pass away, and my word shall not pass away.”

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Lūqā said in the beginning of his Injīl, “Because many have desired to write the stories and affairs with which we were familiar, I thought it was my duty to write accurately what I have learned about him.” In the days of King Hairūdis, there was a priest named Zakariyā', who was of the ministers [in the temple] of the family of Abyā. His wife was of the daughters of Hārūn. Her name was Alaisaba'. They were both righteous before Allāh, carrying out his commands without shortcomings in obedience.

⁷ For John the Baptist the Arabic name Yahyā is used here instead of the Christian Yūḥanā which Ya'qūbī himself employed in his comments on the Gospel of Matthew. Mas'ūdī (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 121) speaks of John the Baptist as Yahyā bin Zakariyā and of John the Disciple as Yūḥanā bin Zabdī (Vol. II, p. 305). This distinction has been observed in the current Persian translation of the Gospels, but the Arabic translation follows the Greek and uses Yūḥanā in both cases (*cf.* Matt. iii: 1 and Mark i: 4). It is Yūḥanā that is used in the Arabic translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (Ciasca, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae*, Chap. iv). The Qur'ān invariably has Yahyā (sūras xix: 13-15; xxi: 89; vi: 85; and iii: 34). The name is defined as the one giving life to the religion, i.e. the revivalist (*Jannatu'l-Khulūd*, Table No. 6).

blessed among women." When she saw him she was troubled at his remark, and began to think and to say, "What sort of salutation is this?" The angel then said to her, "Fear not, Maryam, for thou hast met with and found favor with God, verily thou shalt conceive and bring forth a son. Call him Aisū'. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest. And the Lord his God shall give him the throne of his father Dā'ūd, and he shall reign over the family of Ya'qūb forever. To his kingdom there shall be no passing away and no interruption." Maryam said to the angel, "How shall this be when no man has touched me?" The angel said to her, "The Holy Spirit (*rūḥu 'l-qudus*) will come upon thee, and the one to be born from thee shall be holy and be called the son of God. And behold thy kinswoman, Alaisaba', she is pregnant with a son in her old age, and this is the sixth month for her who was called barren, because Allāh is not unable in anything." Maryam said, "Behold, I am the handmaiden of Allāh, be it unto me as thou hast said." Then Maryam went to the house of Zakarīyā' and asked about the health of Alaisaba'. When the wife of Zakarīyā' heard Maryam speaking, the child moved in her womb, and she was filled with the Holy Spirit (*rūḥi 'l-qudus*), and said to Maryam, "Blessed art thou among women, for when with great joy I heard the voice of thy salutation the child moved in my womb."

Alaisaba', the wife of Zakarīyā', brought forth a son, and they circumcised him on the eighth day and called him Yūḥanā.⁸ At once Zakarīyā''s mouth was opened and he spoke and asked the blessing of Allāh, who is exalted, and he was filled with the Holy Spirit, and said, "Blessed is the Lord, the God of Israel, who has tested his people and who has set them free by redemption, and who has raised up for us a horn of redemption from the family of Dā'ūd, as he has said by the tongues of his pure prophets."

When Maryam's days were finished, Yūsuf went up with her to the mountain of al-Jalīl,⁹ and she gave birth to her first-born

⁸ The use of Yahyā on the previous page suggests that al-Ya'qūbī regarded the two names as equivalent and used them indiscriminately.

⁹ Perhaps the author's effort to be brief has led to this inaccuracy (*cf.* Luke ii: 4).

son, and she wrapped him in clothes, and she laid him down to sleep in the stable, because there was no proper place for her where they two were lodging. . . . Then the angel of the Lord came to them [plural] and the glory of Allāh shone upon them and they were greatly afraid of him. But the angel of the Lord said to them, "Do not fear or be grieved, for surely I bring you glad tidings with great joy that shall be for all the world."

Lūqā then related the descent of al-Masīḥ from Yūsuf back to Adam, and how when he was eight days old they took him to circumcise him, according to the custom of Mūsā (*ka sunnati Mūsā*). They named him Aisū' and circumcised him. They took him to the temple and brought as a sacrifice a pair of pigeons to be offered for him. There was a man there whose name was Sham'ān, one of the prophets, and when they came near the altar to sacrifice for him, Sham'ān took him up [in his arms] and said, "Surely mine eyes have seen thy compassion, O Lord, so let me die any time." The family [of Aisū'] went up every year to Jerusalem at the time of the Passover. He served the great and they were wont to be surprised at him because of what they saw of his wisdom. When Aisū' reached thirty years of age, he entered the temple on the Sabbath and stood up to read, according to his custom, and he was given the Book of Ish'ayā the Prophet. He opened the Book and found [the place where it was] written, "The Spirit of the Lord (*rūḥu 'l-rabbi*) is upon me, therefore he has chosen me and appointed me to preach good news to the poor, he has sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach the good news of deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight for the blind, to set the broken-boned and to preach to prisoners pardon and forgiveness, and to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Then he closed the Book and gave it again to the servant, and he withdrew and sat down. The people marvelled at his act and said, "Is not this the son of Yūsuf?"

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

As for Yūḥanā the apostle,¹⁰ it is he who declares in the beginning of his Gospel concerning the relationship of al-Masīḥ, "Before all was the Word (*kānat al-kalimah*), and this Word

¹⁰ *Al-Sullāḥ*, a word derived from the Syriac, is the term employed.

was with Allāh and Allāh was himself the Word. This Word [existed] before all things existed. It was by it that life came into being, and the life is the light (*nūr*) of men; that light (*ḏiā'*) was in darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it."

There was a man whom Allāh sent who was named Yūḥanā. He came as a witness, to bear witness to the light, in order that mankind should find the right way and believe through him. He was not the light, for the light of truth will not cease to shine and to be manifest in the world, and [the world] was in his guidance [lit., in his hand], but the world did not know him. To his own he came, but his own did not accept him. But as for those who accepted him and believed him, Allāh gave them authority that they shall be called the sons of Allāh, those who believe in his name—whosoever is born, not of blood and not of the desire of the flesh and not from the lust of man, but is born of Allāh. And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we saw the glory of it, glory like the "one" who is from the Father, full of grace and equity. And Yūḥanā bore witness to him and cried out, saying, "This one, I said, is coming after me, and he was indeed before me, because he preceded me. And of his completeness have all we received, superabundant grace for the former grace. Because the Law came down upon the hand of Mūsā but truth and grace by Aisū', al-Masīḥ, ———, the Word which did not cease in the breast of its Father."

OTHER THINGS THE DISCIPLES RELATED ABOUT JESUS

This is the saying of the four disciples, the authors (*aṣḥāb*) of the Injīl, concerning the relationship of al-Masīḥ. They have related in addition, however, other things that were said about him, and that he healed the sick and the leper, made the lame to stand and opened the eyes of the blind. He had a companion called al-Āzar [Lazarus] in a village called Bait 'Anyā near Bait al-Muqaddas [Jerusalem]. Al-Āzar died and was put in a cave where he remained for four days, and then al-Masīḥ came to this village. Then two sisters of al-Āzar went forth and said to al-Masīḥ, "O our Lord (*sayyidanā*), behold your friend al-Āzar has died," and al-Masīḥ grieved for him and asked, "Where is his grave?" They took him to the cave, upon which there was

a stone. He said, "Move away the stone." They said, "As it is four days, he stinketh." Then he approached the cave and said, "O my Lord, to thee is the praise, behold, I know that thou dost give all things: but I speak for the sake of the assembled company, that they may believe and know for a surety that thou art the one who sent me." He then said to al-Āzar, "Arise!" and al-Āzar arose, dragging the grave clothes upon him, and with his hands and his feet bound. There was a company of the Jews with them and they believed on him, and came to look upon al-Āzar, and they were amazed at him. The great ones of the Jews assembled, therefore, with their learned doctors, and they said, "We fear that our religion (*dīn*) will be corrupted and that the people will follow him." But Qiyāfā, the chief priest, said to them, "Surely it is better that one man should die than that the nation be destroyed altogether." So they agreed to kill him.

Al-Masīḥ entered Jerusalem on a donkey, and his companions met him with palm-branches. There was a certain Yahūdḥā bin Shamʿān among the companions of al-Masīḥ. And al-Masīḥ said to his companions, "Behold, one of you shall betray me, one of those who eat and drink with me," meaning Yahūdḥā bin Shamʿān. Then he began to give commands to his companions, saying, "Surely the hour is come in which the son of man (*ibnu 'l-bashar*) will remove to his Father. I will go away to a place where you will not be able to accompany me. Nevertheless, keep my last command (*waṣīyatī*), and there will certainly come to you al-Fārqaḷiṭ.¹¹ He will be with you as a prophet. When al-Fārqaḷiṭ comes to you with the spirit of right and truth (*rūḥi 'l-ḥaqqi wa 'l-ṣīdqi*), he is the one who will witness to me, and behold, I have told you this only in order that you should remember it when his time comes. As for me, verily, I said it to you, but I go to the one who sent me. Whenever the spirit of truth (*rūḥu 'l-ḥaqq*) comes, he shall lead you to all the truth, and he shall tell you distant affairs, and he shall praise me, and in a little while you shall not see me." Then it was that al-Masīḥ raised his eye to heaven, and said, "The hour is come, behold, I have glorified thee on the

¹¹ It is evidently the Greek word *παράκλητος* (Comforter) rather than *περίκλητος* (famous) that al-Ya'qūbī has here undertaken to spell in Arabic (cf. Rodwell, *Koran*, lxi: 6, note).

earth, and the work which thou didst order me to do, I have finished" [John xvii: 4]. Then he said, "O God, if there is no escape from my drinking this cup, then make it easy for me, but let it not be as I wish, but according to thy wish, O Lord!"

Al-Masīḥ then went away with his disciples to the place where they were accustomed to gather. Yahūdḥā, who was one of the disciples, was familiar with this place. When he saw that the guards were on the lookout for al-Masīḥ, he urged them on, along with those whom the priests had sent, until he arrived with them at the [appointed] place. Al-Masīḥ came forth to them and said, "Whom do you want?" They said, "Aisū' al-Nāṣarī." Aisū' replied, "I am he." They then drew back, but returned and al-Masīḥ said to them, "I am Aisū' al-Nāṣarī, if you want me, then take me away," in order that the saying may be fulfilled [note omission of saying]. Sham'ān al-Ṣafā [Simon Peter] had a sword which he unsheathed, and he struck the servant (*'abda sayyidi 'l-kahanah*), and cut off his right hand. Al-Masīḥ said, "O Sham'ān, put thy sword back into its sheath, for I do not refrain from drinking the cup which my Lord hath given me." The guards then took al-Masīḥ and tied him fast, and they brought him to Qiyāfā, the chief of the Jews, who had advised killing him. Sham'ān al-Ṣafā was walking behind him and entered along with the crowd. Someone said to him, "Are you a disciple of this Nāṣarī?" He said, "No." When al-Masīḥ was brought before the chief of the Jews, he began to speak to him, and al-Masīḥ answered him something that he did not understand, so one of the guards struck him on his jaws. Then they took al-Masīḥ out from Qiyāfā to Fartūrīn [Praetorium],¹² and said to him, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" Al-Masīḥ replied, "Is it from thyself that thou saidst this, or have others informed thee about me?" He began then to address him and to say, "My kingdom is not of this world." The guard then took a crown of purple [*min urjuwān*, from the Persian *arghwān*]¹³ and placed it on his head, and they began to

¹² The author here makes the mistake of taking the Greek word *πραιτωριον* for the name of an individual or the designation of an official (John xviii: 28), perhaps in confusion with Matt. xxvii: 11.

¹³ This mistake may be due to the fact that the bush *urghuwān*, from which a purple dye is derived, also has thorns (*cf.* John xix: 2). This verse

strike him. Then they took him out with this crown upon him, and the chief priests said to him [to Pilate], "Crucify him!" But Fīlātūs said to them, "You take him and crucify him. As for me, I did not find any cause against him." Then they said, "It is obligatory to crucify and kill him, because he said, 'Truly it is, the son of Allāh' " (*qāla innahu ibnu 'llāhi*). Thereupon he brought him forth and said to them, "You take him and crucify him." So they took al-Masīh and brought him forth. They made him carry the piece of timber on which they crucified him.

This is in the Injīl of Yūḥanā [John xix: 16, 17], but Mattā, Marqus, and Lūqā say, "They placed the timber on which he was crucified on the neck of a man of Cyrene" (Matt. xxvii: 32; Mark xv: 21; Luke xxiii: 26). They brought him to a place called *al-Jumjumah*, the skull [Golgotha], which is in the Hebrew "the sign of the head," (*aima kālla*)¹⁴ and this was the place where he was crucified. There were two others crucified with him, one on one side and one on the other. Fīlātūs wrote on a placard, "This is Aisū, the Nāṣarī, King of the Jews," and the chief priests said to him, "Write: 'The one who said, It is the King of the Jews.' " But he answered, "What I have written that I have written." Then the guards divided the clothing of al-Masīh among themselves. His mother Maryam and Maryam the daughter of Qilūfā and Maryam al-Majdalāniya were standing looking upon him, and he spoke to his mother from the cross [lit., "from the timber"]. Those guards took a sponge with vinegar on it and held it close to his nose, but he disdained it. Then it was that he gave up his spirit. They [the guards] came to those two who were crucified with him, and broke their legs. One of them also took a spear and thrust it into his side, and blood and water came forth. After that one of his disciples spoke to Fīlātūs requesting that he should take him down. [This disciple] took embalming perfumes, myrrh and aloes, and wrapped him in linen cloths and perfume. In that place were gardens, with a new tomb, and in this they placed al-Masīh. This occurred on Friday. When it was the first day [of the week], according to what the appears in a different order in the Arabic translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (Ciasca, *op. cit.*, p. 191).

¹⁴ In the text is written *aimā khālah*.

Christians say, Maryam al-Majdalānīya went early in the morning to the grave, but she did not find him. So she came to Shamʿān al-Ṣafā and his companions and informed them that he was not in the grave, so they went and did not find him. But Maryam went to the grave a second time and she saw there two men, both arrayed in white garments. They said to her, "Do not weep." After this she looked behind her and saw al-Masīḥ and he spoke and said to her, "Do not come near me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father, but go to my brethren and tell them, 'I will ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God.' "[And they say], "Truly, in the evening of the first day, he came to them and said, 'Peace be with you; as my Father has sent me, even so I send you, and if you forgive the sins of anyone, they are forgiven.' And they said, 'He who speaks with us is a spirit and an apparition.' But he said to them, 'Look at the marks of the nails on my finger [*sic*] and at my right side.' He then said to them, 'Blessed are those who have not seen me and yet believed upon me.' They brought him a piece of fish and he ate it, and then said to them, 'If you believe on me and do what I have done, it shall be certain that you shall not place your hands on a sick man except he recover and death shall not injure him.' Thereupon he was raised from them, when he was thirty-three years of age."

This is what the authors of the Injīl say, and they differ in all its meanings. Allāh said, "They slew him not, and they crucified him not, but a similitude was made for them. And they who differed about him were in doubt concerning him. No sure knowledge had they about him, but followed only an opinion, and they did not really slay him, but God took him up to himself." (Qur. iv: 156, Rodwell.)¹⁵

¹⁵ Al-Ya'qūbī makes no effort to explain away this radical difference between the Qur'ān and the Injīl. Mas'ūdī maintained that knowledge of Jesus "is limited to that which God has mentioned about him in his book, and what is made known by the tongue of his Prophet Muḥammad." He mentions various things the Christians relate about him, but remarks, "We turn away from this, however, because God the Most High has revealed nothing about it, and also his Prophet Muḥammad has given no news of it." (Mas'ūdī, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 122-4).

[NOTES FROM THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES]

When 'Īsā al-Masīḥ was raised [to heaven], the disciples assembled at Jerusalem on the Mount of Olives, and they were in an upper chamber. In it were Buṭrus, Ya'qūb, Yūḥanā, Andarāwus, Fīlibus, Tūmā, Bartalmūs, Mattāwus and Ya'qūb. . . . Sham'ān stood upon the stone [*sic*] and said, "O company of brethren, it surely was necessary that the scripture be fulfilled, that which the Holy Spirit spoke beforehand." They wanted to appoint a man to complete the Twelve, and they nominated Mattā and Barsabā. Then they said, "O God, show us which to choose." The lot fell on Mattā. There descended upon them a violent wind, filling the upper chamber where they were, and they saw something like a tongue of fire, and they spoke in different tongues. Then they said to Buṭrus, "What wilt thou do?" Buṭrus said to them, "Arise and be baptized, every man of you, in the name of al-Masīḥ [Acts ii: 38], and turn away from this crooked people" [verse 40]. Then Buṭrus and Yūḥanā began, whenever they entered the synagogue (*al-kanīsah*), to proclaim the affair of al-Masīḥ, and they explained his work and called men to his worship. But the Jews refused them this [privilege] and seized them and imprisoned them. Then they set them free. Afterwards they said, "Let us choose seven men to be consecrated to God, to mention his wisdom and his Christ." So they chose Iṣṭifānus, Fīlibus, Abruḥūrus, Nīqānūr, Ṭīmūn, Barminā, and Nīqūlāwus of Antioch. They had these men stand up and they prayed for them and consecrated them. These men began therefore to explain the affair of al-Masīḥ and to invite men to their faith. Būlus [Paul] was their most zealous opponent and their greatest persecutor. He was wont to kill whomsoever he could from among them, and to seek them out in every place. He set out to go to Damascus to apprehend some people who were there, when he heard a voice calling to him, "O Būlus, how do you persecute me!" He was so frightened that he could not see. Then came Ḥanāniyā to him and consecrated him until he departed. His sight returned, and he began to stand in the synagogues and give witness to al-Masīḥ, and to proclaim his holiness. But the Jews sought to kill him, so he fled from them. Then he associated

with the disciples in inviting men and in speaking as they spoke, showing forth religious devotion in the world and abstinence from the things of the world, until the apostles advanced him over themselves and made him their head. He would rise to speak and would mention the affair of the Banī Isrā'īl and of the Prophets. Then he would mention the life of al-Masīḥ, and he would say, "Incline with us to the Gentiles, as God said to al-Masīḥ, 'I have made thee a light for the Gentiles, that thou shouldst become a means of salvation to the regions of the earth.' " And every man of them spoke according to his opinion. They said, "It is still necessary to have regard to the Law, and to send to every country someone to invite them to this faith, and to forbid them sacrifices to idols, and adultery, and the eating of blood." And Būlus went forth with two men to Antioch in order to establish the religion of baptism. Then Būlus returned and was arrested, and taken to the king of Rome. There he began preaching and mentioning the life of Christ. The people plotted to kill him because he perverted their religion, and mentioned al-Masīḥ and proclaimed his holiness.

MARGARET DOOLITTLE

*Former Teacher of Latin and History in Hillside
School, Norwalk, Connecticut; Former Missionary
of the Presbyterian Church, Tripoli, Syria*

“LESSONS IN RELIGION AND ETHICS”

*(A Translation of a Muslim Text-Book in Religion
for Primary Schools)*

“LESSONS IN RELIGION AND ETHICS”

By MARGARET DOOLITTLE

IN OCTOBER 1928 there appeared in the *Moslem World* an article entitled, “Moslem Religious Education in Syria.” Among the texts mentioned in that article was one named *Lessons in Religion and Ethics*, by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Majdhūb, printed in Beirūt in A.H. 1343. The following is a translation of the first volume of that text, intended for second and third grades in primary schools. The translation is prepared as an example of the material presented to Muslim children, and of the method used in presenting that material.

It must be remembered that the government schools of Syria were taken over from the Turks by the present mandatory government, and that they are attended chiefly by Muslim children. Religious instruction is therefore given in accordance with the faith of the majority of the children.

The translation omits only the questions which follow each lesson.

LESSON 1. CLEANLINESS

My son, cleanliness is necessary for the preservation of life; for it conserves the health of the body and aids its growth and perfection. It is expected of you not only in regard to your body, but in regard to your clothes, the place where you live, the articles which you use, and whatever you eat and drink. Then keep your body free from all dirt, and avoid everything which is considered defiling, either from the point of view of canon law or from the point of view of common sense. Be regular in bathing, in brushing your teeth, in washing your hands, and also in rinsing the mouth and the nose, in washing your entire face and your hands up to the elbows, in washing your head and ears, and your feet, including the ankles. In this way you will find the energy of the whole body increased, and you will keep your health.

And when you have washed your face, and your hands up to the elbows, and wiped part of your head, and washed your feet to the ankles, if you have expressed your intention of making an ablution when you began to wash your face, and have done everything in good order, you have now completed a ceremonial ablution, and may be allowed to pray, and to touch and carry the Qur'ān. For when anyone rises to pray he must have completed his ablution, and likewise if he touches or carries the Qur'ān.

An ablution may be performed only with pure water: that is, with water in which no unclean thing has been dissolved, and which has not been used to remove any impurity.

LESSON 2. THANKS TO THE GIVER OF GOOD

My son, if one of your playmates gives you an apple or something you like, you count it a kindness he has done you and accept it with thanks. I am sure that you recognize what your parents do for you and thank them for their goodness. Now God has created you and given you health and mind, and you ought consequently to thank and praise him and worship him as is due.

The best method of worship is prayer; for it is the very foundation of religion, and includes thanks to God and praise of his holiness; and it deters from disgrace, from wrong and from iniquity.

And God has prescribed for us definite times of prayer, with a certain number of prostrations. We then stand in his presence and worship and thank him. And these times for prayer are morning and noon and afternoon and sunset and evening of every day and night. (Although God accepts our prayers at other times.)

Morning prayer has four prostrations, two customary and two required; noon prayer has eight, two customary, four required, and two customary; afternoon prayer six, two customary and four required; evening prayer five, three required and two customary; evening prayer nine, four required, two customary, and three odd, *witr*; and the *witr* is a very commonly accepted custom.

LESSON 3. HOW TO PRAY

One who is about to pray takes his stand facing the Qibla, and forms a definite intention to make a certain prayer. He then says,

"God is most great," and recites the "prayer upon turning to Mecca," and after saying "I take refuge in God," and "In the Name of God" he recites the "Fātiḥa." Then he bends forward, saying as he does so, "Praise to my Lord, the great," three times. Then he stands erect, saying "God hears whoever praises him." Then he prostrates himself, and says as he does so, "Praise to my Lord, the most high," three times. After sitting back for a moment he prostrates himself a second time, and with that ends the first prostration. Then he rises for the second, says, "In the Name of God" and recites the "Fātiḥa," bends, stands, prostrates himself twice, and sits back. Then he recites the creed and blesses the Prophet, and with that he ends the second prostration.

If the prayer is to end at this point, it is concluded with a salutation to right and then to left. At morning prayer, in the course of the second required prostration, after the bending, the prayer "al-Qunūt" is recited.

If the prayer is to consist of four prostrations, one rises after the creed and performs two more like the first, and then gives the salutation. If it is to consist of three, the second is repeated before the salutation. Throughout prayer concentration is essential.

LESSON 4. FORMULAS OF PRAYER

Prayer on turning to Mecca :

I have turned my face toward him who has created heaven and earth, in piety and submission, nor am I of the polytheists. I devote my prayer and my devotion, my life and death to God, Lord of the worlds, who has no partner. Thus have I been commanded so long as I am a Muslim.

Text of the creed :

Peace and blessing, prayer and praise be unto God !

Peace to thee, O Prophet, and the mercy of God and his blessings. Peace upon us, and upon the devout servants of God. I testify that there is no god but Allāh, and that Muḥammad is the prophet of Allāh.

The prayer of Abraham :

O God, bless Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad, as thou didst bless Abraham and the family of Abraham; and be gracious to Muḥammad and to his family as thou wast gracious

to Abraham and to his family. In all the creation thou art worthy of praise and glory.

The supplication with which prayer concludes:

O our Lord, grant us thy favor in this world and in the world to come, and guard us from the punishment of the fire. O Lord, lead not our hearts astray after thou hast guided us; and grant unto us thy mercy. Thou art the giver of gifts.

The Qunūt:

O God, guide me among those whom thou hast guided, and preserve me among those whom thou hast preserved; befriend me among those whom thou hast befriended, and bless me in that which thou hast given. Keep me from the worst of that which thou hast decreed. For thou dost decree, and nought is decreed against thee. He is not humbled whose friend thou art; and he whose enemy thou art is not exalted. Thou art blessed, O Lord: thou art the Most High. We beseech thy forgiveness, O God, and unto thee we repent. May God bless our lord Muḥammad, the illiterate prophet, and bless his family and his companions, and give them peace.

LESSON 5. DIET, THE BEGINNING OF MEDICINE

My son, if some illness happens to you, you look for a physician to treat you; and then, if you find one and describe to him your symptoms, he prescribes medicine for you, and arranges a diet, in order that your stomach may rest, and its strength may be restored, and any tainted matter in it may be gotten rid of; for the stomach is the source of disease, and diet is the beginning of medicine.

And some people have become accustomed to take at the beginning of every season a purgative draught, by which they cleanse their stomachs and renew their energies, seeking rest and health of body, for the stomach which is continually at work grows weary, and cannot properly digest what is put into it, so that tainted material accumulates and the body is weakened and its health ruined.

And God has taught us to diet by fasting, as the tradition says: "Fast and be well."

The Muslims in all parts of the earth fast during the month Ramaḍān, for fasting then is enjoined upon them. This is an important form of worship, and brings a great reward.

In order that one may perform the fast, he must form his intention during the night, and not eat or drink from dawn until sunset, and refrain from all other things that invalidate the fast.

He who fasts will have good health and a sound mind: his heart will be tender, and he will pity and help the poor. He will be able always to keep himself from things forbidden, and will be accustomed to endure the trials of this life.

LESSON 6. ALMSGIVING

Every one of us knows that the poor contend against great difficulty in this life. It is not possible for them to eat at the proper time, nor to wear fine clothes. They labor to gain the price of food and drink, through heat and cold, snow and rain: yet they are not able to satisfy themselves whenever they wish. Therefore God most high has laid a definite tax upon the goods of the rich, for the benefit of the beggar and the needy; and has made the payment of this tax a moral duty incumbent upon them.

The Prophet¹ was merciful and kind to the poor. God has laid it as an obligation upon the rich to give every year one-fortieth of their goods to the poor. This is called legal alms, and is a debt of the rich to the poor. It is a great crime not to pay it to those who deserve it.

God has also required the giving of one-tenth of income to those who deserve it; and the distribution of the festival alms is incumbent at *'Id al-Fiṭr* upon every Muslim, young and old.

The Prophet said: Use almsgiving as a medicine for your imperfections, and fortify your possessions with the legal alms. It is also said: The doing of kindnesses guards against the attacks of evil.

LESSON 7. THE PILGRIMAGE

Pilgrimage is journeying to the Holy Ka'ba at special times for worship. He who has found provisions, and an animal for

¹ The usual phrase which follows the title is omitted throughout for the sake of brevity.

riding, when the road is safe and there is a good opportunity to travel, and who has not performed a pilgrimage, goes to Mecca the honored, that fair city in which was born the Prophet Muḥammad. And he makes the circuit of the Holy Ka'ba, which is the Qibla of the Muslims, and the place toward which they turn from all parts of the earth.

Before the pilgrim enters Mecca, he forms a definite intention of entering the sacred place with reverence, and removes all garments which are sewn, replacing them with those which are not sewn. Thus the rich and the poor, the Arab and the foreigner are made equal, and all stand upon the mountain of 'Arafāt in one costume: there is no difference in the presence of God, except in devotion. The pilgrim makes the sacrifices and feeds the poor and needy, desiring to please God. The pilgrimage includes also conditions and essential parts, duties and customs, all of which you shall learn in what follows.² It is desirable after the pilgrimage to visit the tomb of the Prophet in al-Madīna the enlightened.

The pilgrimage is like a great fair, in which are gathered together persons from all the nations: Arabs, Turks, Circassians, Javanese, Bukhārāns, Indians, Chinese, Persians, Afghāns, and others from all parts of the Muslim world. All these become acquainted and friendly, and the ties of brotherly affection are drawn close, inasmuch as their religion is one, and their aim is one: namely, the seeking of forgiveness from God. And the pilgrim visits many places and passes through many countries, and meets his brother Muslims; and the meeting of brother with brother is great joy. The pilgrimage is an important form of worship, and brings a great reward.

LESSON 8. THE CHILDHOOD OF MUḤAMMAD

The Prophet was born in Mecca, on Monday, the twelfth of Rabi' I, in the year of the Elephant. His father's name was 'Abdallah bin 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib bin Hāshim bin 'Abd Manāf. His mother was Āminah, daughter of Wahb bin 'Abd Manāf bin Zuhra bin Kilāb bin Murra. Both his parents were of the tribe of Quraish, which is the most honored tribe of the Arabs.

² This is the first book of a series of three.

His nurse was Ḥalimah, of the tribe of Sa'd, who kept him among her people. And she said that from the beginning of his stay with her, blessings came to her house, and life became easier. She noticed in him peculiarities distinguishing him from other children, as, for instance, that he would take only one breast and refused that taken by his foster-brother. When he was four years old Ḥalimah returned him to his mother.

His father 'Abdallah had died seven months before his birth, and his place as guardian of the child was taken by the grandfather, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and the mother Āminah. When the child was six years old his mother died, and the care of him was assumed by a servant, Umm Aiman, under the supervision of his grandfather, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib.

LESSON 9. THE YOUTH OF MUḤAMMAD

He was good-tempered, chaste, beloved by his relatives for the excellent qualities which he possessed and for his pleasant personality. His grandfather, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, had a mat on which no one ever sat but himself. Muḥammad once took his seat upon it, and some of those present reproved him, whereupon the boy wept. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who was by that time blind, happened to come by just then, and asked: "Why is my son crying?" He was told, "He wanted to sit on the mat, and they prevented him." "Let my son sit on it," he responded; "for he is conscious in his soul that he deserves honor, and I hope that he will come to glory such as no Arab before him has ever had, and as no Arab after him will have." 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib used to place the child in his lap at meals, and he never snatched at the food as children usually do. And no one ever addressed him, young or old, that he did not answer, "Labbaik," which is the height of good manners and modest behavior.

And when he was eight years old his grandfather 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib died. His uncle Abū Ṭālib took the place of guardian, and considered the boy one of his own children. His family never finished a meal without Muḥammad; but if they ate with or after him they finished with his blessing. And Abū Ṭālib often cautioned them not to eat without Muḥammad.

LESSON 10. MUḤAMMAD AS A YOUNG MAN

He was serious, strong, with opinions worthy of respect, keen of mind, and had an excellent reputation among his tribe and his clan. And when the factions disagreed on the question of who should put the Black Stone in its place—at the time of the rebuilding of the Ka'ba—they accepted him as arbitrator. He bade them to put the stone in the middle of a cloak, and while each faction took hold of one edge of the cloak, he with his own hand lifted the stone and put it into its place. In this way was settled the question about which the factions were on the point of fighting.

Muḥammad engaged in commerce, and journeyed with his uncle Abū Ṭālib to Syria for reasons of trade. Moreover, Khadījah, daughter of Khuwailid, sent him with her servant Maisara to Syria on business and he gained a considerable profit. And when he returned to Mecca he returned to her her principal and what he had gained in its entirety. And he was illiterate; he could neither read nor write.

He took a negligible share in the idolatry which was common among his countrymen, and kept himself apart from the customs of the Ignorance. He used to retire to the caves to worship God, and to consider means by which he could rescue his people from the abyss of error.

LESSON 11. HIS APPOINTMENT AS PROPHET

God appointed Muḥammad as a prophet when he was forty years old, to call people to believe in one God and to abandon the worship of idols. He exhorted them with persistence and energy, and used to attend their gatherings and recite to them what was sent to him by revelation, and to caution and warn them. But only a very small number believed in what he said. In fact, their opposition grew to such an extent that they even plotted to kill him, and he fled by the command of God to al-Madīna, he and his companions, where he was very cordially received. In al-Madīna Islām increased; and when the Arabs realized that it was growing day by day, they were seized with intense apprehension and decided to destroy it. But that decision was not carried out, for the Muslims resisted for ten years. During these years a num-

ber of battles took place, among which were those of Badr and of Uḥud.

LESSON 12. THE GREAT BATTLE OF BADR
AND THAT OF UḤUD

The great battle of Badr took place in the second year of the Hijra, between 313 Muslims and a thousand of Quraish. In it the Muslims were victorious, and killed seventy of Quraish, and took prisoner seventy of the best known of them. Twelve Muslims were killed.

The wealthy prisoners were ransomed by their families with money; but those who were skilled in reading and writing were released only on condition that each teach these arts to ten boys of al-Madīna.

In the important battle of Uḥud the Muslims were at first victorious, but were later routed because of their disobedience to the order of Muḥammad. Quraish were anxious for revenge, because of the killing of their best men in the battle of Badr, which had greatly disturbed the Arabs. And they gathered three thousand men fully equipped. The Prophet met them with a thousand men, but three hundred hypocrites deserted, under the lead of 'Abdallah ibn Ubayy. And when the battle began, Muḥammad bade the archers, fifty in number, to keep their positions on the top of a mountain, whether the Muslims were victorious or not. But when the Muslims had the advantage, some of the archers left their positions, and busied themselves with plunder. When the polytheists saw that the mountain was bare of archers, they renewed the attack and routed the Muslims. The Prophet and the best of his companions resisted; but the Prophet's face was wounded and a front tooth knocked out. Some of his companions were wounded, and the number of slain reached seventy, among whom was Ḥamza, the uncle of the Prophet. Quraish lost 320.

LESSON 13. HIS FAREWELL PILGRIMAGE

In the tenth year of the Hijra he announced his intention to go on pilgrimage. Forty thousand persons started with him, and a hundred thousand gathered from all directions to go with him, before he reached Mecca and performed the pilgrimage rites.

Then on the ninth day of Dhū 'l-Hijjah he went to Mount 'Arafāt, and there came to him this word of God: "This day have I completed your religion, and given to you the fullness of my grace, and I am satisfied that your religion should be Islām." And he knew that his work was done, and that his time on earth was short; and he delivered an affecting address, in which he explained the sacredness of blood, of wealth, and of furniture, and the duty of returning pledges to their owners. And he said the Muslims were brothers, and in the sight of God the only difference between Arab and foreigner was one of devotion. And he forbade them to return to the factions of the days of the Ignorance, and urged them to cling to the holy Book. On the tenth day he left Mecca, intending to go to al-Madīna, but when he reached the pool of Khumm, between Mecca and al-Madīna, he made an address in which he included many of the prophetic decisions. And when he had bade the people treat his family well he travelled on to al-Madīna. Near the end of Šafar he was attacked with headache, which kept him in bed. During his entire illness he attended the mosque and officiated, with the exception of three days, when he requested Abū Bakr to officiate. He finally died in the morning of Monday, the twelfth of Rabī' I, in the eleventh year of the Hijra, after he had given his message, and advised the people, and built up the foundations of the religion, and guided men by the Qur'ān, which was sent down to him during the space of twenty-three years. The news of his death was a great shock to his companions, and people were in doubt whether or not to believe it. Then they took pains in washing him, in enshrouding him, and burying him in the place where he died, that is, in the house of 'Ā'isha. His age was sixty-three years, of which he had spent fifty-three in Mecca and ten in al-Madīna.

LESSON 14. MUḤAMMAD'S CHARACTER AND PERSONALITY

Muḥammad was not inclined to show himself as superior to anyone, and was kind to his family and servants. He was accustomed to mend his clothes and shoes, and to milk. If he borrowed money, he paid it on the day it was due. He was exceedingly merciful to everyone, and endured patiently their ill-treatment and

vanity. He did not act rashly, and consulted his noble companions on important questions. When he walked, he did so dignifiedly and quietly. He sat sometimes on the floor, sometimes on a mat, and sometimes on a cushion. Of his sayings are the following:

God has had mercy on a man who has spoken good and gained by it, and on a man who has kept silence and been safe.

There are two things the value of which is not recognized until they are gone: health and youth.

He who shows the way to good is as if he had done good.

There are four things which if a man should do in a single day God will forgive him his past and his later sins: to keep the fast, to give to a beggar, to visit the sick, and to attend a funeral.

No man has faith who has not fidelity.

Who deceives us is not of us.

Do good to your kindred if only by a greeting.

LESSON 15. ABŪ BAKR THE TELLER OF TRUTH

He was made Khalīfa in the same day on which the Prophet died, in the eleventh year of the Hijra. He was a man of affairs, an ascetic, humble, gentle, serious, brave, patient, merciful; and his Khalifate was a model of divine wisdom, of strengthening religion, and of Muslim affairs. He died in Jumāda II, in the thirteenth year, when he had been Khalīfa two years and four months. His age was sixty-three years. Of his sayings are:

Offend not others, that they may not offend you.

Do no evil to your neighbor, for the neighbor will go, while the evil remains.

There are three things which if they be concealed in a man will be concealed against him: envy, breach of promise, and treachery.

(God says: Your envy is against yourselves, and, Whoever breaks a promise breaks it against his own soul, and, Treachery affects only one's own.)

LESSON 16. 'UMAR BIN AL-KHAṬṬĀB

He was made Khalīfa on the same day on which Abū Bakr died, according to an agreement with the latter, that is, on the eighth of Jumāda II, in the thirteenth year of the Hijra. He resembled Abū Bakr in his general behavior, in his carrying on the holy war, in his perseverance and patience. He became famous for his justice, and for his care for the well-being of his subjects. He made extensive conquests. He died in Dhū 'l-Hijjah in the

twenty-third of the Hijra. He was assassinated by Abū Lu'lu'a the Magian. His Khalifate lasted ten years, six months, and eight days. He was sixty-three years old. Some of his sayings are:

He who conceals his secret keeps the power to choose in his hands.

The wisest of men is he who has the best excuse before men.

Three things God has guaranteed: The reward of those who do good will not be lost; God will not give guidance to the deceivers; and he will not make good the evil deeds of the wicked.

Outward manliness is in spotless garments.

LESSON 17. 'UTHMĀN BIN 'AFFĀN

He was made Khalīfa three days after the burial of 'Umar, on the first day of the twenty-fourth year. He was exceedingly gentle and merciful, and when he became Khalīfa these qualities increased toward his subjects. He used to feed other people on food fit for princes, and himself eat oil and vinegar. He was killed on the eighteenth day of Dhū 'l-Hijjah in the thirty-fifth year of the Hijra. His age was eighty years, and he was Khalīfa for twelve. Of his sayings are the following:

The best actions are three: the fear of God in private and public, justice whether a man is pleased or displeased, and economy in wealth and in poverty.

Let it suffice you that the envious is troubled when you are happy.

Traffic with God in almsgiving, and gain.

Have patience, or you must be satisfied with regret.

LESSON 18. 'ALĪ BIN ABĪ ṬĀLIB

He was made Khalīfa on the day on which 'Uthmān was killed. He was learned, ascetic, devout, a good horseman, and brave, with other virtues too numerous to mention. The Prophet once said: "I am the city of learning, and 'Alī its gate: who wishes to enter, let him come to the gate." And "The best judge among you is 'Alī." He was killed in Kūfa by Ibn Muljim, in the fortieth year of the Hijra, after a Khalifate of four years, nine months, and eight days, at the age of sixty-five. Among his sayings are the following:

Good manners are an ornament in wealth, a treasure in need, a help to manliness, a friend in the assembly, a delight in solitude. Faint hearts are strengthened by them and weak spirits revived. Dull eyes become keen, and those who seek, by them attain their aims.

Laziness in prayer is from lack of faith.
Fear God: then you will be faithful to others.
The true conduct of a man is known by his private life.
The garment of piety is the most honorable of garments.
If God humbles his servant, he prevents him from gaining learning.

LESSON 19. THE BLESSING OF THE FAMILY

My son, God created you weak, not able to do anything, and put into the hearts of your parents kindness and affection toward you. They tried to take care of you, and kept you from cold and heat, and watched over you in illness. Then thank God who blessed you with them, and act humbly to them, and say: O God, have mercy on them, as they brought me up when I was little.

As to your brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles, they share with you in meeting the difficulties of your life, and by them burdens and their terrors are lightened for you. Then treat those who are older with reverence and respect; and treat those who are younger with love and kindness, and if you see one of them committing some offense against good manners, speak to him gently, and explain to him the harm of such ill conduct.

It is also your duty toward your brothers and sisters to help and assist them in every way you can, and do them no harm. And indeed you must act toward every relative according to his rights, in order that your family may be like a firm building, each member strengthening every other.

My son, honor God in the servants, for they are of the family of God, who have offered themselves for your service, that they may earn their bread by the sweat of their brows. Then feed them with food such as you eat, and clothe them with garments such as you wear, and lay not on them burdens beyond their strength. Do not torment them, for they are your brothers: their spirits are like yours. Do not act proudly toward them, as in bidding them walk behind you; for the distance of any creature from God is like that by which they walk behind you.

LESSON 20. THE ORPHAN

My son, the worst house among the Muslims, is that in which an orphan is ill treated, and the best that in which an orphan is well treated. Then have pity on the orphan, and treat him well,

and be to him a generous brother. Imagine yourself an orphan like him, without a father to help you, or a mother to take you in her arms: how sad and troubled you would be!

And you, O orphan, do not grieve. God is with you, inasmuch as he has bidden us do good to you in his word: "As to the orphan, do not oppress him." And whoever has God with him and his own strength to depend on will surely succeed. Do not despair: work: rely on your own soul and give it the best of discipline. "Surely your Lord will make it possible for you to please him." "Did he not find you an orphan and provide a refuge for you?" Muḥammad was brought up as an orphan: take him for a good example. And when you grow up and succeed, if God will, aid orphans, and be grateful to those who aided you in your childhood. Then you will be a shining example of the result of a good deed, and will encourage well-doing toward orphans.

LESSON 21. OBEDIENCE TO THOSE IN AUTHORITY

My son, you will never attain to happiness either in religious or in secular matters and will never succeed, except by following the divine law, that is, by obeying the commandments of God and of his Prophet, and by avoiding all that they have forbidden. And you must also obey all those in authority over you, as rulers, and parents and teachers and judges, and all who are older than you, for they are your guides to what is for your good and for your happiness, and for your well-doing both in religious and in secular matters. It is God who has made them responsible for you, and given them authority over you, in order that they may save you from the abyss of ignorance and guide you to right conduct, by which alone you escape from evil. And do not let lack of understanding of their reasons prevent you from obeying their commands; for your guardians are wiser, and more learned, and more experienced than you, and they know better what is good for you. Then it is your duty to meet their requirements and to do so cheerfully, to be grateful to them, to love and to respect them.

LESSON 22. THE CARE OF HEALTH

It is right that a sensible person should guard in arranging his life against the worst of the accidents which may happen to

his health. For it is obvious that he has no possession better than his health. So use all necessary means to keep your health, by cleanliness and exercise and medical advice. Avoid harmful foods and beware of overloading your digestion. Do not be greedy, or talk at length of your likes. Be systematic about your times of retiring and rising: do not sleep directly after eating, nor when you are very tired. Do not drink when you are perspiring, or expose your body to draughts. Breathe good clean air. Avoid extremes of heat and cold. Change your clothes at least three times a week in summer and twice in winter, and do not wear tight clothing.

LESSON 23. LEARNING AND ACTION

My son, the honor given to learning is greater than can be described. There is no comparison between the learned and the ignorant, on account of the distinction which God himself has placed between them. Learning strengthens a man when he is small and advances him when he is grown up. If he is noble, he becomes superior to his contemporaries: if he is of modest station, he is a leader among his brothers; and if he is poor, by means of learning he lives a comfortable life. The Prophet said: "Seek learning though in China," and, "People in general are dead: only the learned are really alive."

But, my son, you must act as well as learn; for learning without action is like a tree without fruit. Act with perseverance and energy and sincere determination. Let your aims be high: do all the good that is in your power, as you carry on your own work, in order that you may gain your desires. And do not be deterred from your work by consequences and difficulties which you think may rob you of the fruits of your labors and prevent you from accomplishing your purpose. Those difficulties will disappear as you struggle with them, persistently endeavoring to improve your condition; for results are obtained only by patience, and human effort removes mountains. A man has only what he himself brings to pass: that will be seen and will receive sufficient reward.

LESSON 24. THE SCHOOL

What a fine thing a school is! How great its benefits are! In it the pupil learns what profits him, at the hands of professors who

have given their lives to the service of learning and morals, hoping to benefit their people. In it also are companions who try to gain something for the service of their country.

School days are the happiest and most blessed of life; for the pupil's mind is free; he lives on the bounty of his father or guardian, and he has no responsibility but the learning of his lessons.

My son, your teacher disciplines your spirit and trains your mind, and it is he who explains to you what is good for you and what is harmful. You ought therefore to requite him with love and respect, to obey him and listen carefully in class, to sit in his presence with the greatest order and attention. It is very wrong to argue with him, or to allow your attention to be distracted by play or conversation with another pupil, for that is the way of lazy people. You ought also to love your companions and to co-operate with them when necessary, and to restrain them from evil with kind words.

LESSON 25. PATRIOTISM

I love my country, in which I was born and grew up, the air of which I have breathed, the water of which I have drunk, the products of which I have eaten, and in which I have lived in the company of my family, my comrades, and my teachers. I prefer it to other countries, because in it are the public works which our ancestors left for us to enjoy—places of worship, schools, fountains, bridges, roads, tilled fields—and I am glad to live here. I have been protected by its flag, and have obeyed its laws; and now that I am grown up, I do my best to help and protect it. I devote all I have of value to its service, for that is its glory and the happiness of its children, whom I am now training to love it, without regard to sect or religion; for all are the children of God, and the dearest to him is he who does most for his children. And the love of country is a part of the faith.

LESSON 26. TAXES

The government needs money to help it in securing the well-being of its citizens, and security from the attacks of enemies. This money is paid in by individuals, each according to what is assessed upon him, in various taxes. It is the duty of each one who

is asked to pay a tax to do so at the proper time, and no one seeks to evade it except one who is unpatriotic and destitute of every virtue.

LESSON 27. MANLINESS

My son, manliness consists in self-respect, loftiness of ideal, faithfulness to religion, kind treatment of others, patience under affliction, and a proper estimate of values. A man without ideals has no manliness, and a man without manliness has no religion. Then treat others kindly and concern yourself with high thoughts, not with low. Associate with the best people, not with the rash and foolish and lazy. Avoid things forbidden; abstain from things belonging to others; beware of lying and of all for which you should apologize. Have pride; be pure; take care of your good name; be kind-hearted, and sympathetic to those in affliction and need. Respect the old; be kind to the young. "If you are rough, no one will remain near you." Be sure that outward manliness is in pure garments, and that he who has dealt with men and not oppressed them, talked with them and not lied to them, and promised them and not failed them, he it is whose manliness is perfect, whose justice is apparent, and who should be received as a brother.

LESSON 28. COURAGE

Some children are afraid to walk alone in the streets, to enter an empty dark house alone, in spite of the fact that that is the most despicable kind of vice. I fear God and no one else, so long as I obey his commandments, treat others justly and kindly, neither lie nor speak insultingly, neither deceive nor tell tales, neither harm any nor intend harm. Therefore no one can harm or injure me. Whoever lives at peace with others is himself safe from their retaliation; so I am a brave child. However, I do not thrust myself into danger by meddling in that in which I have no concern or right. If I have a right to anything, I seek it, and justly defend it till I obtain it. But rash action and violent feeling every perfect man ought to avoid, for these are not courage. A man came to the Prophet and said: "Give me a piece of advice, but be brief, so that I may comprehend"; and the Prophet said, "Do not be angry." The man came several times, but the Prophet always said the same thing.

LESSON 29. TRUTH AND LYING

My son, if you have done anything, good or bad, and are asked about it, and if you tell exactly what has happened, you are called truthful. And if you do not tell what happened, you are called a liar. How beautiful truth is! God and the Prophet love the truthful, his family also, and every one else. How shall you be truthful? If you speak, do not lie: if you promise, do not fail; and if you are entrusted with something, play no tricks. Thus the Prophet commanded us, that we might not be hypocrites. God said, "O you who have believed, fear God and tell the truth." How hateful lying is! The liar brings harm upon himself and others, and no one will believe him, even if he does tell the truth. God and the Prophet and everyone hate him, and it has been said: "No one can deal with a liar."

LESSON 30. ECONOMY AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Economy in regard to money means keeping from unwise spending, that is, saving something from income, however small, and never spending more than one's income. And that you should pay cash for everything and avoid debt, for debt is a great misfortune. And that you should not spend depending on future gain, but estimate your necessary expenses and the sum that will cover them, and then spend from that sum carefully. Otherwise your life will be straitened, your reputation impaired and your debts increased. God has said: "God does not like the extravagant"; and "Spendthrifts are brothers of Satan." The Prophet said, "How good economy is!"

LESSON 31. BENEVOLENCE

My son, the natures of men are different and their minds of many sorts, yet you have to mix and deal with them. Are you interested in a way by which the hearts of all will unite in affection toward you, and you can live with them in happiness? That way is benevolence, for men are slaves to it. God is with those who fear him, and with those who do good. Benevolence is to approach those who cut you off, to give to those who have forbidden you, and to forgive those who have done you wrong, and to serve God as seeing you.

My son, the reward of benevolence will not be lost. Ye who have done good have done it to yourselves. Whoever does a good deed receives it tenfold. The kind ward off the attacks of evil. Do good, for God loves the benevolent.

Beware of doing evil to any, in word or deed, and of causing evil to come upon him; for who digs a pit for his brother falls into it. The reward of evil is evil like unto it. An evil trick affects only its inventors. Your Lord wrongs no one.

My son, you ought also to treat the animals kindly, and strive to lighten their burdens, and be careful not to give them pain. The Prophet said, "God requires kindness to all things." Therefore if you kill anything do it well, and let someone sharpen your knife, that the animal may not suffer.

My son, kindness brings pleasure to the heart of the kind, in which his heart rejoices, his breast is enlarged, and his eye cooled. He sleeps with a calm mind, a cool eye, and a quiet conscience. But the unkind feels qualms in his heart, his breast is contracted, his thought disturbed, and his eyes cannot sleep. Your Lord keeps watch.

Receive forgiveness and bid others be kind as thou wast bid, and
avoid the ignorant.

Be gentle in speech to all mankind, for kindness is thought well of
in those who possess influence.

E. E. ELDER

*Principal Ezbekiya School for Boys, Missionary of
the United Presbyterian Church, Cairo, Egypt*

AL-ṬAḤĀWĪ'S "BAYĀN AL-SUNNA
WA'L-JAMĀ'A"

AL-ṬAḤĀWĪ'S "BAYĀN AL-SUNNA WA'L-JAMĀ'A"

By E. E. ELDER

ABŪ JA'FAR AḤMAD AL-ṬAḤĀWĪ (d. A.H. 321) was a contemporary of al-Ash'arī who is the supreme authority for most Muslim theologians. Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī, the founder of the other orthodox school of theology which flourished in Transoxiana, also lived in the same period. The work of these men indicates the turn in the tide regarding the use of logic. Before their time the use of rational arguments in defense of Islām was considered by the more pious Muslims an abomination.

But Abū Ḥanīfa (d. A.H. 150), the earliest of the jurists who founded an orthodox school of canon law, had resorted to opinion in interpretation of the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth. In his day theology had not emerged as a separate science and was only distinguished from matters of practice by being called the greater *Fiqh*. In theology Abū Ḥanīfa has often been classified as a Murji'ite, one who delays judgment regarding professed Believers. Even the most extreme orthodox could not ban this position as heresy. When al-Ash'arī formulated the theological system that was to be accepted as final by most Muslims, there still remained a place in orthodoxy for those who avoided his extreme conclusions which they felt jeopardized the moral basis for Allāh's actions. The opinions of Abū Ḥanīfa were the foundation for a school under the name of his disciple al-Māturīdī. He maintained among other things that man had ability and actions of choice which made him a responsible moral being. The differences between the schools of al-Ash'arī and al-Māturīdī have been analyzed by Abū 'Udhba in his *al-Rawḍa al-Baḥīya* (Ḥaidarābād, 1904) and by Sayyid Murtaḍā in his commentary on the *Iḥyā'*, Vol. II, pp. 8 ff.

The confession of faith, *Bayān al-Sunna wa'l-Jamā'a* (also called '*Aqīda Ahl al-Sunna wa'l-Jamā'a*, or *Risāla fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*), written by al-Ṭaḥāwī, is one of the earliest creeds of the

Muslim faith. It is interesting, if for no other reason, because it dates from the beginning of the fourth century of Islām when dialectic was first being used to organize a system of belief. Al-Ṭaḥāwī's fame rests on his being the greatest Ḥanafī lawyer produced in Egypt.¹ Most of his books deal with subjects related to Muslim jurisprudence. In his brief compendium of Islāmic doctrine, which is translated below, al-Ṭaḥāwī's position resembles that of Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Māturīdī in shunning the extremes of al-Ash'arī. However, he often avoids explicit statements that would class him as belonging to one school or the other. There is no mention whatever of some of the key phrases that mark the Māturīdite school. This lack of definiteness in theological definition may be due to the rhymed prose in which much of the creed was written. Yet it often reflects a pre-Ash'arite orthodoxy that shrank from controversy over difficult problems. The section on the *Imām* shows a stand very characteristic of the early Murji'ites.

The contrast between the explanation of the creed by al-Ṭaḥāwī and those of al-Sanūsī, al-Faḍālī, and even that of al-Ghazzālī is very striking. With them the great emphasis, because of the development of the science of scholastic theology and its influence, is placed on the meaning of the qualities of Allāh. Al-Ṭaḥāwī as a representative of his time and as a canon lawyer was much more interested in the *sam'īyāt*, the matters to be accepted on authority.

In making the translation, use has been made of two manuscripts of the text of *Bayān al-Sunna wa'l-Jamā'a* with the commentary of 'Umar b. Ishāq b. Aḥmad al-Ḥanafī (d. A.H. 773) found in the Egyptian Library at Cairo. With the exception of some few omissions and a very few additions made by these manuscripts they agree with that of the text published in Aleppo in A.H. 1344, which merely states that the pamphlet as printed is based on two old manuscripts. The translation includes the longer form of the Aleppo publication as well as the half dozen phrases and clauses found only in the Cairo manuscripts.

¹ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. IV, pp. 608 ff.

In the name of Allāh, the Merciful, Compassionate One. Praise belongs to Allāh, the Lord of the worlds. The very learned Imām and defender of Islām, Abū Ja'far al-Warrāq al-Ṭahāwī of Egypt—Allāh have mercy on him²—said:

This is an exposition of the doctrine of the People of the Approved Way and the Community (*ahl al-sunna wa'l-jamā'a*) according to the school of the following canon lawyers of the Faith, Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu'mān b. Thābit al-Kūfī, Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb b. Ibrāhīm al-Anṣārī, and Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī—Allāh be well pleased with them all; and of what they believe in the way of the fundamentals of religion and hold in religion regarding the Lord of the worlds.

We say concerning the unity of Allāh, trusting in the assistance of Allāh—who is exalted of Himself—that Allāh is one. He has no partner, and nothing resembles Him, nor does anything dis-able Him. There is no deity besides Him. He is Prior (*qadīm*) without a beginning; Continuing (*dā'im*) without an ending. He is not destroyed nor does He perish. Nothing comes into being except as He wills. Instinctive perceptions (*al-awḥām*)³ do not apprehend Him nor do intelligences comprehend Him. Creatures are not like Him. He is a Living one who does not die, an Ever-wakeful one who does not sleep, a Creator without a need; and Allāh is the absolutely Independent One, a Sustainer without provision; one who puts to death without fear, and one who raises from the dead without fatigue.

He together with his qualities (*ṣifāt*) remains Prior to his creatures. By their coming into being (*kawn*) He is not increased in qualities with something which He was not before them. Just as He together with His qualities is from eternity, so also He remains to eternity. The name, "The Creator" (*al-khāliq*), is not acquired from the creating of the creation, nor is the name, "The Maker" (*al-bāri*), acquired from His origination of things made. To Him is the idea of lordship, nor is He under a lord; to Him is the idea of the Creator, nor is He created. Just as He is called "Bringer to life of the dead" after he brings them to life,

² The eulogia as a rule are omitted after the first occurrence.

³ See Macdonald, "Wahm and its Cognates," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1922, pp. 506 ff.

to His Prophet a revelation. The believers assented to the Qur'ān in this way as a Reality.

They assured themselves that it was in reality the speech of Allāh—who is mighty and majestic—and not something created like the speech of mankind. Whoever on hearing it asserts that it is the speech of mankind is thereby an Unbeliever. Allāh has reprehended him, rebuked him and threatened him with hell-fire (*saqar*), since Allāh has said, "I will broil him in hell-fire" [Qur. lxxiv: 26]. When Allāh threatened with hell-fire whosoever said, "This is only the speech of mankind" [Qur. lxxiv: 25], we know and are assured that it is the saying of the Creator of mankind, and the saying of mankind does not resemble Him.

Whoever qualifies Him with any of the ideas of mankind is thereby an Unbeliever. Whoever perceives this takes warning and refrains from anything that is like the saying of Unbelievers, he knows that Allāh together with His qualities is not like mankind.

The Beatific Vision (*al-ru'ya*) is a Reality for the People of the Garden without there being any encompassing or modality (*kayfīya*). This is according to the pronouncement of the Book of Allāh—who is praised, "On that day beaming faces to their Lord shall be looking" [Qur. lxxv: 22]. The explanation of this is as Allāh wills and knows. All that has come down on this subject in sound tradition from the Messenger of Allāh is just as he said; its meaning is as He wills. We shall not go into that by interpreting it according to our opinions nor imagining according to our wandering desires.

No one is secure in his religion except the one who surrenders to Allāh and to His Messenger—Allāh bless him and give him peace—and commits the knowledge of that wherein he is confused to Him who knows. The foundation of Islām is firmly established only on surrender and submission. Whoever seeks knowledge about that the knowledge of which is forbidden him, and whose understanding is not contented to surrender, has his quest preclude him from declaring the absolute unity of the Deity, from pure cognition and sound Belief. So he vacillates then between Unbelief (*kufr*) and Belief (*imān*), assertion and con-

tradiction, confession and denial, being troubled by the whispering of al-Shayṭān, perplexed, rebellious and separated from the community of the faithful, neither an assenting Believer nor a contradicting denier.

Belief in the Beatific Vision for the people of the Abode of Peace [*cf.* Qur. vi: 127; x: 26] is not valid for him who considers it an instinctive perception or interprets it through intelligence, since the proper interpretation of the Vision of every idea which is connected with lordship is to leave off interpretation and to see the necessity of surrender. According to this is the religion of those sent from Allāh.

Whoever does not avoid denial and making comparisons with the Deity, slips and does not hit the mark regarding Allāh's being far removed, for our Lord—who is high and majestic—is qualified with the qualities of unity and described with attributes of uniqueness. This does not mean that he is one, as one of mankind. Allāh—praised is He—is exalted of Himself. He is exalted of Himself above all limits, aims, fundamentals, members, and means. The six directions do not encompass Him as they do the rest of things formed.

The Ascension (*al-mi'rāj*) is a Reality. The Prophet was taken on the night journey in person while awake to heaven and from thence to whatsoever exalted place Allāh willed. Allāh honored him as He willed, and revealed to him whatever he revealed. The heart belied not what it saw [Qur. liii: 11]. Allāh blessed him in the last and in the first.

The Tank (*al-ḥawḍ*) with which Allāh honored him as a deliverance for distress for his people is a Reality. The intercession which He has prepared for them is a Reality, as has been related in the traditions. The covenant which Allāh took from Ādam—on whom be peace—and his seed is a Reality. Allāh knows, inasmuch as He never ceases, the number in one aggregate of those who enter the Garden and those who enter the Fire. That number neither increases nor decreases, so also He knows their deeds inasmuch as He knows what they will do. "Everyone is facilitated for that for which he was created," and actions are reckoned according to the final actions.

The happy one is he who is happy through the destiny of Allāh, and the miserable one is he who is miserable through the destiny of Allāh. The principle of the decree of Allāh is His secret in His creation. Neither angel near to His presence nor prophet entrusted with a message has gained knowledge of that. Going deeply into and speculation about that subject bring one near to desertion by Allāh and are steps of denial and the position of disobedience, so be on your guard against that in thought, consideration and evil suggestion. Verily Allāh has concealed the knowledge of His decree from His creatures and forbidden them to search for it, as He has said, "He shall not be questioned about what He does, but they shall be questioned" [Qur. xxi: 23]. Whoever asks, "Why did He so?" has rejected the judgment of the Book and he who does this becomes an Unbeliever.

This is the sum of what is needful for him whose heart is enlightened of the friends of Allāh. This is the position of the firmly grounded in knowledge. There are two kinds of knowledge: knowledge existent (*mawjūd*) in creation, and knowledge non-existent (*mafqūd*) in creation. The denial of existent knowledge and the claim to non-existent knowledge are Unbelief. Belief is not established except by the acceptance of existent knowledge and by abandoning the search for non-existent knowledge.

We believe in the Tablet (*al-lawḥ*) and the Pen (*al-qalam*), and all that is written therein. Were all creation to conspire together against that which Allāh had prescribed that it come into being, in order to make it not come, they would be unable for it. Were they all to conspire against that which Allāh had not prescribed, in order to make it come into being, they would be unable for it. The Pen is silent as to what shall come into being until the Day of Resurrection.

Whatever misses the creature could not have hurt him, and whatever hurts him could not have missed him. It is incumbent on the creature to know that Allāh foreordained in His knowledge everything of His creation that comes into being, then he decreed it by His willing with a firm well established decreeing in which there is nothing that destroys or changes, nothing that removes nor alters, nor transforms, nothing that decreases nor

increases any of His creation in His heavens or earth. Nothing is brought into being except by His bringing it into being (*takwīn*). And this can only be good and beautiful.

This is a part of the covenant of Belief, the fundamental of knowledge and the confession of the unity and lordship of Allāh, just as Allāh said in His mighty book, "And He created everything and then decreed it absolutely" [Qur. xxv: 2], and He also said, "And the command of Allāh was a decreed decree" [Qur. xxxiii: 38]. So woe to him who becomes an adversary of Allāh's decree or brings to the consideration of it a diseased heart. In searching for the unknown through his instinctive perceptions he has sought a hidden secret; and because of what he has said about it he has become a great liar.

The Throne (*al-'arsh*) and the Seat (*al-kursī*) are a Reality, as Allāh has shown in His mighty Book. He whose majesty is great is independent of His throne and whatever is beneath it, and encompasses everything above it, having rendered His creation incapable of encompassing it.

We say that Allāh took Ibrāhīm as a friend and spoke to Mūsā a speaking [Qur. iv: 162] for the sake of Belief, assent and submission. We believe in the Angels, the Prophets, and the Books which were sent down on those entrusted with a message. We bear witness that they were according to the manifest Reality. We call the people of our Qibla Muslims and Believers, as long as they continue to confess that which the Prophet brought and assent to what he said and narrated.

We do not enter into vain discourse regarding Allāh—who is mighty and majestic—nor do we dispute about the Religion, nor argue about the Qur'ān. We know that it is the speech of the Lord of the worlds, which the faithful Spirit brought down and then taught to the chief of the First and the Last, Muḥammad. Nothing of the speech of creatures equals the speech of Allāh. We do not say that it is created nor do we dissent from the Community of the Muslims.

We do not impute Unbelief to any of the People of the Qibla because of a sin, so long as he does not make it lawful, nor do we say that a sin which accompanies Belief will not harm the one who does it. We have hope for those of the Muslims who do good,

yet we do not feel secure regarding them, nor witness that theirs is the Garden. We beg of Allāh forgiveness for their evil-doers, and fear for them and ask forgiveness for them as for ourselves, but do not despair for them. The feeling secure from Allāh and the despair of Allāh remove one from the religion of Islām (*al-milla*). The way of Reality lies midway between these two for the people of the Qibla. The creature does not depart from Belief except by the denial of that which brought him into it.

Belief is confession by the tongue and assent by the intellect that all which Allāh sent down in the Qur'ān and whatever of the Law and evidence is authentic regarding the Messenger of Allāh is a Reality. Belief is one, and its people are fundamentally equal. Distinctions among them come through their real nature and godliness, through forsaking wandering desires and holding to that which is better.

The Believers are all of them the friends of the Compassionate One. The most noble of them are those who are most obedient and follow most closely the Qur'ān. The foundation of Belief means Belief in Allāh, his Angels, his Books, his Messengers, the Last Day and the Quickening after Death, and that His decree of good and evil, the sweet and the bitter is of Allāh. We believe in all that, and we make no distinction between any one of the Messengers [*cf.* Qur. ii: 130; iii: 78] and we assent to all of them regarding that which they brought.

The People of great sins do not remain in the Fire forever, so long as they die declaring the unity of Allāh even though they are unrepentant after they meet Allāh, yet cognizant that they are at the disposal of His will and judgment. If He wills, He forgives them and pardons them, through His free grace, as Allāh—who is mighty and majestic—has said, "Allāh does not forgive the one who joins aught with Himself but He forgives anything short of that to whomsoever He wills [Qur. iv: 51, 116]. If He wills he punishes them in the Fire in proportion to their offense in accordance with His justice. Afterwards He will withdraw them from it, in accordance with His mercy and the intercession of those interceding from among the people obeying Him, and will send them to the Garden. That takes place because Allāh is the protector of those who know Him and He has not made them to

be, either in this world or that which is to come, like those who deny Him, who were denied His guidance and have not obtained His protection.

O Allāh, Benefactor of Islām and its people, guarantee to us Islām, that we may meet Thee therein.

We approve worship (*al-ṣalāt*) behind anyone of the People of the Qibla whether righteous or immoral, and we approve worship for whomsoever of them dies. We neither lodge any of them in the Garden nor in the Fire; nor do we bear testimony against them of Unbelief or polytheism or hypocrisy so long as nothing of these appears in them. We leave their secret thoughts to Allāh.

We do not approve the use of the sword against any one of the nation of Muḥammad unless it is necessary to use the sword against him.

We do not approve secession from our Imāms and those in authority. Even though they tyrannize over us we do not curse them nor restrain any hand from obeying them. We consider obeying them an ordinance of Allāh because a judgment regarding the rule of affairs is a part of obedience to Allāh [*cf.* Qur. iv: 62]. We pray for their welfare and security.

We follow the Approved Way and the Community, and we shun that which deviates, is contrary, and divisive. We love the people of justice and trustworthiness, and hate the people of tyranny and treachery. We say, "Allāh knows better concerning that the knowledge of which is for us confused."

We approve the wiping on the inner shoes on a journey and at one's abode, just as it has come down in the precedent (*al-athar*).

Pilgrimage (*al-ḥajj*) and Holy War (*al-jihād*) are two obligations applying until the Day of Resurrection, to those who are in authority of the Imāms of Muslims, whether righteous or immoral. They are not annulled by the tyranny of a tyrant nor are they diminished through the justice of a just man.

We believe in the benevolent Scribes [*cf.* Qur. lxxx: 15] and that Allāh has made them keepers over us. We believe in the Angel of Death who is charged with seizing the spirits of the worlds. We believe in the punishment of the grave, and in its bliss for him who is worthy; and in the questioning of the dead man

in his grave by Munkar and Nakīr, as to who is his Lord, what is his religion and who is his prophet, just as it has come down in traditions from the Messenger of Allāh and his Companions—Allāh be well pleased with them all.

The grave is either one of the meadows of the Garden or one of the pits of the Fire. We believe in the Quickening after Death, the recompense on the Day of Resurrection for actions, the compensation, the accounting, the reading of the Book, reward and punishment, the Bridge (*al-ṣirāṭ*) and the Balance (*al-mizān*).

The Garden (*al-janna*) and the Fire (*al-nār*) are created and do not pass away nor come to an end. We believe that Allāh created the Garden and the Fire before creation, and He created people for them; those whom He willed are for the Garden because of a free grace on His part, and those whom He willed are for the Fire because of justice on His part. Every one does according to that for which he was made, and becomes that for which he was created.

Good (*al-khayr*) and Evil (*al-sharr*) are decreed for creatures. The ability, by which the action comes into being from the standpoint of the assistance of Allāh with which it is not permissible to describe the created being, accompanies the action. But as for ability from the standpoint of good health, capacity, being empowered and the soundness of the instruments, this precedes the action and it is to this the discourse is connected. That is just as Allāh said, "Allāh does not impose upon a soul legal responsibility which is not in its capacity" [Qur. ii: 286].

The deeds of creatures are the creation of Allāh and the acquisition of creatures. Allāh does not impose upon them legal responsibility except that which they are able to bear, and they are not able to bear except that which He has imposed on them. This is the interpretation of the saying, "There is no strength or power except in Allāh the High and Great." That is, He says, "No one has a device nor a motion, nor a turning away from disobedience to Allāh except by the help of Allāh, nor has any one power to perform obedience to Allāh and abide therein except by the assistance of Allāh."

Everything occurs according to the willing, knowledge, and destiny and decree of Allāh. His willing has overcome all willings; His desire, all desires; His destiny, all destinies. Nothing comes into being except as He wills. Allāh does as He wills, being at no time a wrong-doer. He is far separated from every evil and adversity and far removed from every defect and blemish. He shall not be questioned about what he does, but they shall be questioned [Qur. xxi: 23].

And in the prayer of the living for the dead and the giving of alms for them there is an advantage to them. Allāh answers prayers and satisfies needs and possesses everything. Nothing possesses Him; nor can one be independent of Allāh for the twinkling of an eye. Whoever is content to be independent of Him for the twinkling of an eye has become an Unbeliever and joined the people of adversity.

Allāh is angry and well pleased not as a mortal is.

We love the Companions (*aṣḥāb*) of the Messenger of Allāh. We are not remiss in loving any one of them nor do we repudiate any one of them. We hate him who hates them or mentions them except with good. We mention them only with good. The love of them is religion, belief, and doing good; the hatred of them is unbelief, hypocrisy, and perverseness.

The Khalifate is established after the Messenger of Allāh first to Abū Bakr, the Very Veracious, out of preference for him and because he had precedence over all the nation; then to 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb; then 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, then 'Alī b. Abū Ṭālib. They are the rightly guided Khalīfas and the rightly led Imāms.

We love the ten persons whom the Messenger of Allāh named and announced to them the glad tidings of the Garden. We bear witness that they are in the Garden according to the witness of the Messenger of Allāh. His statement is the Reality regarding this. The ten are Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, 'Alī, Ṭalḥa, al-Zubayr, Sa'd, Sa'id, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf, and Abū 'Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ. They are the faithful of this nation—the good pleasure of Allāh be on them all.

Whoever speaks well of the Companions belonging to the Messenger of Allāh, of his wives, who are pure of any defile-

ment, and of his seed, who are far separated from every abomination, is innocent of hypocrisy. The learned of the early Fathers (*al-salaf*), their successors (*al-tābi'ūn*), and those who came after them of the people of narrative⁵ and precedent (*athar*), and the people of *fiqh* and speculation are only to be mentioned favorably. Whoever mentions evil of them is not in the right path. We do not prefer any one of the *Walīs*⁶ to any of the Prophets. We say "One prophet is better than all the *Walīs*." We believe in what has come down of their Graces (*karāmāt*)⁷ and that of their narratives which is authentic from trustworthy people.

We believe in the indications of the Hour (*al-sā'a*), the appearance of al-Dajjāl, the descent of 'Īsā b. Maryam from heaven, the rising of the sun from the west, the appearance of the Beast of the Earth from its place and of Yājūj and Mājūj. We do not assent to diviners and soothsayers, nor to any one who makes claim to anything contrary to the Book, the Approved Way, and the Agreement of the Nation.

We consider the Community as real and correct, and division we consider a turning aside from the right and an affliction.

The religion of Allāh in heaven and on earth is one, namely Islām. He who is majestic and exalted has said, "Verily the religion before Allāh is Islām" [Qur. iii: 17], and "Whoever craves other than Islām for a religion, it shall not be accepted of him, and he shall be in the next world among the losers" [Qur. iii: 79], and "I am well pleased with Islām as a religion for you" [Qur. v: 5]. It lies midway between excess and insufficiency, ambiguity and rendering void, between compulsion and free-will, between security and despair.

This is our religion and our doctrine, both according to the literal and hidden meaning. We are guiltless toward Allāh of everyone who is contrary to that which we have mentioned and explained.

⁵ Although the texts read *khayr* "good," the context suggests *khavar*.

⁶ A *Walī* is one to whom the real nature of things is unveiled, but who is not engaged in the improvement of creatures as is the prophet. *Iḥyā'* Vol. VII, pp. 262 f.; *Dictionary of Technical Terms*, pp. 1528 ff.

⁷ cf. *χαρισματα* of 1 Cor. xii: 9, "by the divine grace."

We beseech Allāh to establish us in it and seal us with it at the end, and preserve us from various wandering desires and different opinions and corrupt schools of thought such as the Comparers (*al-mushabbiha*), the Jahmites, the Jabarites, the Qadarites, and others of those who are contrary to the Community and have allied themselves with error. We are guiltless of them. We consider them erring and corrupt. With Allāh is the preservation (*al-ʿiṣma*) from error.

The statement of dogma is completed by the praise, aid and assistance of Allāh. Allāh bless and give peace to our Master Muḥammad, his people and his Companions.

JOSHUA FINKEL
Brooklyn, New York

JEWISH, CHRISTIAN, AND SAMARITAN
INFLUENCES ON ARABIA

JEWISH, CHRISTIAN, AND SAMARITAN INFLUENCES ON ARABIA

By JOSHUA FINKEL

SCHOLARS* have often been at a loss to determine why the Biblical accounts in the Qur'ān usually differ in structure and detail from those in the Bible, and why the Qur'ānic stories to which parallels may be found in Rabbinic literature are also, as a rule, not quite congruous with their analogies. The conclusion formed in haste is that Muḥammad has fabricated tradition or has altered it, wilfully or inadvertently. And this is an accusation that we frequently meet in works on the origin of Islām. In the great majority of the cases, however, no plausible motives can be found to explain the deviations or the so-called innovations. What would it gain the prophet, if Azār, and not Terah, were the father of Abraham, or if Iblīs, and not the serpent, tempted Eve? Secondly, the discrepancies, as noted in the Qur'ān, are not always unique, but are in some instances duplicated in the Apocryphal, Pseudepigraphic, or Hellenistic sources. This at once makes one suspect that perhaps all the Qur'ānic accounts or fragments of accounts to which one cannot find analogues elsewhere were originally not peculiar to that book, but that they are the only ones of their kind that happened to survive there. Hence, though evidence to the contrary may be lacking, we are not to presume that these variants are idiosyncratic. Since we have now found parallels to some of them, while formerly we could not, we must entertain serious doubts about the uniqueness of the rest of the cases. Of course Muḥammad was not infallible, and was far from being authoritative on the traditions of the *Ahl al-Kitāb*. Slips and errors might have crept into the versions of his narratives. But the differing details are all too many, and gen-

* I wish to express my thanks to Professors Louis Ginzberg and Alexander Marx for their valuable suggestions. In the following Professor Ginzberg's remarks are indicated by the initial G.

erally too closely interwoven with the fabric of the accounts as a whole, to be regarded as random utterances that have dropped into them by chance. With these considerations in view, wilful misconstruction or oversight on the part of Muḥammad must be reduced to a minimum. No one will deny that his confusing Mary with Miriam or his making Haman a contemporary of Pharaoh is either his own misconception or a reproduction of an anachronism as he found it current among his countrymen. But no less than such monstrous identifications or other phenomena equally subversive of genuine tradition could stamp Muḥammad's statements as downright error; and such cases in the Qur'ān are few.

The contingency of error being negligible, and Muḥammad's originality unlikely, to what specific spheres of influence should the Jewish traditions, as met with in the Qur'ān, be assigned? A scholastic Rabbinic Jewry equipped with Talmudic and Midrashic manuscripts, zealously imbibing the lore of the ancient heritage, with the reverberating echoes of their study finding their way into the receptive ears of their Arab neighbors, would be a charming Torah-idyl, but one out of consonance with historical reality. The mentality of the Jews living in Arabia in the time of the prophet was anything but typical of that of Talmud-trained Jews. Since their social organization, their customs and language were Arab rather than Jewish, it is unthinkable that the *disciplina Talmudica* should have allowed so much atrophy of Jewish life and thought. Should we argue that centuries of isolation from the main centers of civilization in Palestine and Babylonia could have brought about far-reaching assimilation even among groups possessed of a rich Jewish cultural background, we would be losing the very ground upon which we hope to stand. The Talmudim, the Midrashim, and perhaps even the Mishna would not have been compiled at the time at which we assume the Jews to have migrated to Arabia. The traditions current among them at that period could only have been floating, handed down from mouth to mouth, and likely to have contained a dense growth of material which in recording would have been pruned for purposes of standardization, or for moral or religious reasons, or for any other consideration which in the opinion of the redactor justified cur-

tailment or total elimination. That the so-called Rabbinic tradition, as embodied in the Qur'ān, is often, to say the least, not in perfect accord with its analogues in the Talmud and Midrash, should therefore not appear strange, but, on the contrary, natural and unavoidable.

But what are the fountains of the Jewish tradition from which so many of the Qur'ānic accounts were drawn? Were they Pharisaic or Sadducee in nature, or are they to be identified with the folk tales of the *'Am ha-Areṣ* or of Israel's neighboring nations whose traditions, though in a varying form, might have partly overlapped those in the Bible? These are questions which are difficult to answer, and when proposed sweepingly, instead of being applied to specific instances, perhaps even baffle solution. In the present inquiry an attempt will be made to trace several Qur'ānic terms and passages to their *specific* sources, i.e. instead of simply pointing out the larger spheres of influence, rather trace them to segments in those spheres, if such finer delimitation be feasible. But should even the attempt fail to locate the main-springs of tradition more definitely than heretofore, renewed discussion of the factors involved may, I hope, bring new aspects of the problem to the fore, which perhaps but of little consequence in the present investigation, may prove helpful in future ones.

Abraham is mentioned in sūra iv: 124, as being the "friend (*khaṭīl*) of Allāh." This honorific is given to the patriarch in the New Testament (James ii, 23), Rabbinic, Pseudepigraphic, Hellenistic, as well as Patristic literature.¹ The earliest references to Abraham as "friend of God" are in Isa. xli: 8 (אֹהֶב־י), and 2 Chron. xx:7 (אֹהֶב־י). But in post-Biblical Hebrew literature also the term לִידֵי beside אֹהֶב is employed, so much so that לִידֵי of Jer. xi: 15 is taken as an allusion to Abraham. Thus the word in its context has either given rise to the legend that Abraham visited the destroyed Temple to plead with God for his vanquished children,² or else was associated with it. Now, if we are to maintain that the Rabbinic לִידֵי is merely an echo of the Biblical אֹהֶב, we would be at a loss to account for the change in expres-

¹ For the sources see Louis Ginzberg's monumental work, *The Legends of the Jews*, Vol. V, pp. 207-8, n. 4.

² Menahot, 53b.

sion and its frequent use by the Rabbis. We are therefore constrained to hold that *אֵלֶּה* is independent of *אֵלֶּה*.

Yet both appellations evidently go back to a common origin. *אֵלֶּה* is suggestive of *אֵלֶּה* in the sense of "beloved by the Father" or "the patriarch beloved (by God)." This etymology lies surely at the bottom of the epitheton. Indeed the Targum Yerushalmi (Gen. xviii: 17) speaks of *אֵלֶּה רַחֲמֵי*, and the Peshit̃to translates *זֶרַע אֵלֶּה רַחֲמֵי* (Isa. xli: 8) *זֶרַע דִּאֲבֵרֶה רַחֲמֵי* and *לִזְרַע אֵלֶּה רַחֲמֵי* (2 Chron. xx: 7) *לִזְרַע דִּאֲבֵרֶה רַחֲמֵי*, as if intending a paranomasia. But the remarks by Origen,³ constitute more conclusive evidence, "but many . . . employ . . . the expression 'God of Abraham,' pointing out by the very name the friendship between that just man and God," and by Molon, as cited by Alexander Polyhistor, "after three generations Abraham was born, whose name is by interpretation 'Father's friend.'"⁴ But seemingly Isaiah could not have evolved such an etymology, nor could he have learned it from his countrymen. *רַחֵם* in Hebrew does not denote "to love," but "to commiserate."⁵ *אֵלֶּה = אֵלֶּה* must consequently have been an equation devised by the adjoining peoples of Judaea, and by those whose dialects reduced *ח* to a weaker guttural. In their histories, too, Abraham might have figured as a progenitor, for was he not, to use the other etymology, a "father of a multitude of nations"? Perhaps the Pentateuchal writer objected to an etymology emanating from non-Jews and preferred the one offered by him in Gen. xvii: 5. It might also be that *אֵלֶּה רַחֵם* was the explanation popular in northern Israel, for which the redactor, if he were a Judean, substituted the one current in the south. Through contact with the Aramaeans, the northern tribes might have come to use *רַחֵם* as a synonym of *אֵלֶּה*. And if we are to judge from the Samaritan writings, the tendency for the disappearance of the stronger gutturals must have been much more pronounced in the northern than in the southern kingdom. However, we must not necessarily assume for that purpose the

³ *Against Celsus*, Book I, Chap. xxii.

⁴ Eusebius, *Praep. Evan.*, Book IX, Chap. xix.

⁵ *אֵלֶּה רַחֲמֵי* of Ps. xviii: 2 is evidently an Aramaism or else is to be emended to *אֵלֶּה רַחֲמֵי* [G.]

deterioration of ה into ה. A slight phonetic disparity such as obtains between the above two consonants would not stand in the way of homiletic exegesis. Cf. on this point the assertion of the Yerushalmi:⁶ "קודש הילולים לא מתמנעין רבנן בין הא לחית". קודש הילולים (Lev. xix:24) = קודש הילולים. The Rabbis do not shrink from an interpretation involving the change of ה into ה. Lastly, there is also the possibility that אברהם=אברהם originated in Babylonia, where the acquisition of Aramaic by the Jews facilitated the equation. The passages in Isaiah and 2 Chronicles cited to this effect are certainly post-exilic. As a matter of fact, for the most part when Abraham is mentioned in the Prophets and Hagiographa the passages are post-exilic. Not that the pre-exilic writers hardly knew of Abraham, but that the aura that later draped his name was not yet there to grace it. It was in Babylonia that the many wonderful tales about Abraham were spun. The fact that he is recorded in Genesis as coming from Ur of the Chaldees served the exiled Jews as a basis for linking their history with that of Mesopotamia, thus ingratiating themselves with their conquerors. As much as to say: we Jews are after all not foreigners. Ties from time immemorial bind us to this land, for did not the founder of our race hail from Babylonia? To further win the favor of their compatriots, they idealized him as the one "who surpassed all men in nobility and wisdom"; as the one "who was also the inventor of astronomy and the Chaldaic art"; as the one who "came and dwelt in Phoenicia, and pleased their king by teaching the Phoenicians the changes of the sun and moon and all things of that kind." They also claimed that when "the Armenians invaded Phoenicia, and when they had been victorious and had taken his nephew prisoner, Abraham came to the rescue with his servants and prevailed over the captors"; and that "when there came a famine, Abraham removed into Egypt . . . and dwelt with the Egyptian priests in Heliopolis and taught them many things"; and that "it was he who introduced astron-

⁶ *Pe'ah*, 7, 6 (Krotoshin ed., 20b); for other examples see Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud u. Midrasch*, pp. 19-20. [The richest collection of these and kindred examples is to be found in Waldberg's *ספר דרכי השניים*, Lemberg, 1870. Berliner and others have drawn freely from this work, G.]

omy and the other sciences to them, saying that the Babylonians and himself had found these things out."⁷

The above quotations, taken from an excerpt of a work of the so-called Pseudo-Eupolemos, as cited by Alexander Polyhistor, reveal beyond doubt the apologetic character of the work. Pseudo-Eupolemos, a Samaritan,⁸ represents Abraham as an inventor of the Chaldaic arts and as their exponent to the Phoenicians and Egyptians. This must have reflected the boast of the Babylonians that they had the primacy in these sciences, and that the glory of disseminating them was theirs, and not that of the other two nations. (I suppose the Egyptians and Phoenicians claimed these honors for themselves.)⁹ Pseudo-Eupolemos, expounding the traditions favorable to Babylonia, accords to it cultural supremacy, but ascribes the founding of its civilization to a Babylonian native of his own race, thereby gaining the double object of championing the cause of Babylonia and at the same time impressing his compatriots with the Hebrew contribution to their civilization. When relating the story of the war between Abraham and his servants against the armies of the four kings (Gen. xiv), he styles the latter Armenians instead of Shinarites, etc. Evidently he is at great pains to hide the fact that his progenitor is described as fighting Assyrians and Babylonians, and avers instead that Abraham was fighting their inveterate foes, the Armenians.¹⁰

In the light of these findings, the designation of Abraham as *φίλος θεοῦ*, together with his other extra-Pentateuchal honorifics and tales of adventure, may have originated during the exile in Babylonia. Pseudo-Eupolemos was undoubtedly a descendant of

⁷ Eusebius, *op. cit.*, Book IX, Chap. xvii.

⁸ Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 82 ff. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, Vol. III, pp. 474-7, and Montgomery, *Samaritans*, p. 284.

⁹ Pliny (*Naturalis Historiae*, v: 13) states that the Phoenicians invented astronomy, and Lucian (*Dialogues, on Astrology*, 9), though aware of the claim of the Babylonians, is of the opinion that they acquired this science from other nations.

¹⁰ King, *History of Assyria and Babylonia*, Vol. II, p. 262 and p. 265. [Of course the Elamites, mentioned together with the Shinarites in Gen. xiv: 1, were also the enemies of the Babylonians. Either Pseudo-Eupolemos was not aware of this fact, or else thought it best to suppress it because of political considerations (Persia), G.]

the northern tribesmen whom Sargon deported to Mesopotamia. In his writings he thus preserved the oral tradition of his forbears, or else had already made use of apologetic works written by Babylonian Jews. It should be remembered, however, that the term "friend of God" had not come into use when אברהם was first thought of to mean אלהים. In other words, the etymology did not help to give birth to the idea, but, on the contrary, the idea prompted the etymology. Benjamin is styled ידיד יהוה in Deut. xxxiii: 12, and Solomon ידידיה in 2 Sam. xii: 25. The title must have had a specific theological value in its inception, probably implying then a grosser conception of the Deity.

The question that confronts us now is, through which of the above channels has the appellation *khalīl* percolated into pagan Arabia? There can be no definite answer to it, for the term shows no characteristics of a particular type of transmission. It might have been introduced into the peninsula from Palestine or Babylonia, as an oral or written tradition, or by way of Egypt through the Hellenistic literature, or lastly through Christian influence, not necessarily emanating from the New Testament passage, but from apocryphal or patristic sources. Indeed the Christians would have been tempted to employ the term as subtle propaganda, suggesting as it does a faint parallel to the sonship of Jesus. Moreover, the Christians would have been prone also to use the term for emphasizing the new phase of relationship which they professed Christianity to have instituted between the Deity and mankind. To quote John xv: 14, 15: "Ye are my friends . . . no longer do I call you servants."¹¹ Thus some perspicacious Muḥammadan theologians entertained serious scruples concerning the concept. By deriving *khalīl* from *khulla*¹² meaning "destitution," "perturbation," thus alluding to Abraham's becoming destitute by his trials and sufferings for the cause of God, they ingeniously endeavored to free the expression from its implication of placing the divine and human elements in such levelling relationship and personal attachment, doctrines so utterly foreign to Islām, which conceives of Allāh as always dispensing mercy and punishment

¹¹ cf. *Sifre*, edited by Friedmann, pp. 145a-145b: ישראל נקראו ידידים, and *Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, edited by Schechter, p. 121 [G.].

¹² *Three Essays of Jāhīz*, edited by Finkel, pp. 30-2.

downward, as the ever vertical God and never the horizontal One, as far as the relations between Him and His servants are concerned. Nor do the Samaritans seem to have relished the appellation. They confined it to Abraham, and would not extend it to Benjamin. They broke up יִדִּי יְהוָה into יִד יְד. Cf. the Samaritan Targum *ad loc.*: אֲד אֲד יְהוָה and Abū Sa'īd's translation يد بَدْرَة الله.¹³ However, the reason for depriving Benjamin of the appellation may not be purely theological in their case. Since part of the Temple site was in Benjamin's territory, a political motive should also be suspected.

With such vague knowledge as to the circumstances which brought *khalīl* into Arabia, we shall now pass on to comment on other words in the Qur'ān. Idrīs is mentioned twice in the Qur'ān, in sūra xix: 57 and xxi: 85. In a previous paper, I wrote concerning this enigmatic name: "Idrīs, whom Muslim tradition identifies with Enoch, is another example of Muḥammad's obtuseness with respect to Biblical names. There can be no doubt that the identification is correct. Enoch is the seventh antediluvian patriarch in Gen. v, and Εὐεδώρεσχος is the seventh antediluvian king according to Berossus. One can easily see how Εὐεδώρεσχος, by contracting into the If'īl form, became in Arabic *Idrīs*. Since Εὐεδώρεσχος is the Greek equivalent of *Enmenduranki*, an antediluvian king of the cuneiform records, it follows that Muḥammad's information regarding this personage is ultimately based upon Babylonian sources. Another indication that Enmenduranki, Idrīs, and Enoch are all analogues, is that each plays an identical rôle in his respective literature. To Enmenduranki the godshanded down the heavenly tablets; the Book of Jubilees (iv: 23) says of Enoch that he was the heavenly scribe; and Muḥammadan tradition speaks of him as the first among men to use the pen."¹⁴ I have since come across a passage in Eusebius,¹⁵ attributed to Pseudo-Eupolemos, which offers a corroboration of my thesis in more than an indirect way, to wit: "But the Greeks say that Atlas

¹³ Cod. Adler 1808 (Damascus, 1365) in the possession of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

¹⁴ *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 1931, pp. 18-19. Reprint in the *Moslem World*, April 1932, p. 181.

¹⁵ Eusebius, *op. cit.*, Book IX, Chap. xvii.

invented astrology, and that Atlas is the same as Enoch." This as good as identifies Idrīs with Enoch, for, to be sure, *Ἀτλας, the "Bearer," the "Endurer," who holds heaven on his head and hands, could bear no affinity to Enoch who was translated to heaven to be contained therein as an infinitesimal speck, except for the fact that the former's name resembles in sound the latter's analogue, *Euedores(chos)*. It is also worth while to note that many ancient authors refer to Atlas as the inventor of astrology,¹⁶ but they do not connect him with Idrīs, probably because of their subordinate interest in the identification. Furthermore, Lucian¹⁷ reports from personal observation that Atlas was worshiped in Syria.

The groundwork for this identification is not as flimsy as it seems, if we follow up further the vicissitudes of Atlas. The Greeks transferred his abode to a mountain in northwestern Africa. The local stories about a mountain, called by the natives *Dyrīs* or *Adyrīs*,¹⁸ which is supporting heaven, undoubtedly helped to bring about the identification. Cf. *Naturalis Historiae*, v: 1: "*E mediis hunc harenis in coelum attolli prodidere.*" A phonetic resemblance however striking—and which is far from being the case here, where the resemblance is based not upon identical but allied consonants—would not in itself have suggested a link between the god and the mountain, had not the concurrence of the kindred mythological and folkloristic data prompted the conceptual association. Now with such preconceived notions formed concerning this pair, the Greeks could no longer be impartial to a name like *Euedoreschos*, or rather *Euedoresch* > *Euedores*, as they heard it from the Syrians, and probably reasoned as follows: *Adyrīs*, who is *Atlas*, closely resembles in sound *Euedores*. *Euedores* is about as important a demigod to the Syrians as *Atlas* is to us. Indeed *Adyrīs* and *Euedores*, now only similar in sound, would have sounded exactly alike, but for the dialectical differences between the speech of the Barbarians of Syria and Africa. *Ergo* *Adyrīs* is *Euedores*, and *Euedores* is *Atlas*!

¹⁶ Bouché Leclercq, *Astrologie grecque*, pp. 576-7.

¹⁷ *Dialogues, On the Syrian Goddess*, 38.

¹⁸ Strabo 17, 825; Pliny, *Naturalis Historiae*, v: 13; Solinus 24, 15 (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, Vol. II, pp. 2118-19).

Now that we see that Berossus' Euedoreschos is not an extinct mythological personage, but one worshiped in Syria as late as the second century A.D., and esteemed there as the inventor of the heavenly science, it is best to conclude that Idrīs came into Arabia from Syria, through a Semitic, yet pagan channel.

Iblīs is another name in the Qur'ān for which no philological equivalent can be found elsewhere. To regard it as a corruption of διαβολος is open to grave objection, for according to this derivation the δι of διαβολος was mistakenly considered by the Aramaic speaking peoples as the relative pronoun (די, ד), hence they degenerated the word into *abolos*, which in turn became in Arabic Iblīs. But such a transformation is hardly conceivable. We never meet with a דיאבולוש in Aramaic literature. Neither does Syriac literature know the word, except that it is included in some Syriac-Arabic lexicons as an academic term. (Payne Smith, col. 868.) But דיאבולא appears in an Aramaic incantation text. Concerning this, however, Montgomery¹⁹ remarks that it is "the almost unique Semitic transliteration of διαβολοι. Neither could Ethiopic have been the intermediary. While its literature does contain the word, די is no relative particle in Ethiopic, nor can it otherwise exist independently. I propose therefore the equation Iblīs=Beliar or Belial (בליעל) of the New Testament and Pseud-epigrapha. Belial is described as the opponent of Jesus (2 Cor. vi: 15), as the chief of the evil spirits,²⁰ and as the ruler of the world and lawless angel,²¹ all qualifications that go well with those of the Qur'ānic Iblīs. The *alif* of Iblīs may be regarded as prosthetic and the *sẓn* as representative of the Greek *s* that had been changed from ל. Cf. 'Ατάρβας=עתרבעל, Sicharbas=זכרבעל,²² 'Αννίβας=חנבעל,²³ Σούβας (Sobal)=עובעל,²⁴ Σαλάμβας=צלמבעל.²⁵ However, the difficulty is that βελίας never occurs, but

¹⁹ *Aramaic Incantation Texts*, p. 80.

²⁰ *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, Vol. I, p. 8, implicitly so; cf. Charles, *Apocrypha*, Vol. II, p. 159, n. 8. cf. also Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, pp. 99-101.

²¹ *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, Vol. II, p. 4.

²² Schröder, *Die phönizische Sprache*, p. 84.

²³ *ibid.*, p. 87.

²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 88.

²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 103.

always *Βελίαλ* or *Βελίαρ*. But, be that as it may, it does not preclude the existence of *Βελίας* in colloquial speech. Professor Ginzberg has very aptly suggested that Iblīs might have been the result of an erroneous usage, the *s̄n* having been formed from analogy with *διάβολος* of the Greek speaking peoples, or else Iblīs is a fusion of *διάβολος* and *Βελίαλ*.²⁶ One might further extend this idea and postulate that the change of the *l* to the *s* ending might also have been influenced by the *s* of Idrīs, and perhaps not only the ending, but the vowels as well.

Apparently the Biblical *בליעל* cannot be regarded as having had a direct bearing upon Iblīs. *בליעל* in the Bible is not a personal name, but an ignominious epitheton. Its stem might be *בלע*, with a reduplication of the second radical. It would thus resemble in meaning *שמן* and *משטמה*. However, in the phrase *נחלי בליעל* (2 Sam. xxii: 5), the word may stand for a supramundane being; cf. *כהררי אל* (Ps. xxxvi: 7), *איש אלהים בלעם* is another personal name derived from that stem and of the same signification, for the name of Balaam's father is *בעור*, and it too denotes destruction, both words thus suggesting that they were substituted for the real names. Cf. *בלע בן בעור* (Gen. xxxvi: 32), *ברע* and *ברשע* (Gen. xxxiv: 2), and *מהליון וכליון* (Ruth i: 2). Cf. also *שכם בן חמור* (Gen. xxxiv: 2), where *שכם* should in the light of *יששכר חמור גרם . . . ויט שכם לסבל* (Gen. xlix: 14, 15) be regarded either as metonymic for *חמור*, or else, as the Arabic grammarians would say, a *mudāf*, with *חמור*, the *mudāf ilaḥi*, understood. Moreover, the two consecutive words *חמור שכם* occurring in a Ras Shamra inscription,²⁷ whatever their meaning in the context, are certainly not proper names, and this strengthens the suspicion that the Biblical writer linked *שכם* and *חמור* intentionally. Similarly *בלק בן צפור* means "desolate," "depopulate," and *צפור*, akin to the Arabic *صفر*, signifies "empty," hence the phrase may be translated "the desolater, son of the destroyer," or "emptiness, son of void."

²⁶ Private communication.

²⁷ Bauer, "Ein kanaanäisches Alphabet in Keilschrift," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1930, p. 254).

To return to our subject, Iblīs would seem in the light of the above discussion to have penetrated Arabia either through the medium of the New Testament or some Apocryphal writings, or else through oral tradition, Jewish or Christian. There is also a fourth possibility, the nature of which will be discussed later.

In sūra iii: 89-92 Abraham is described as the founder of the Ka'ba, and in sūra ii: 121 he is assisted in this rôle by Ishmael, and is spoken of in ii: 119 as being together with him covenanted to cleanse its precincts. Either Muḥammad or a group of proto-Muslims is responsible for forging this tradition; probably the latter. It is not improbable that the Christian Arabs of the Jāhiliyya used to perform the *hajj* to Mecca,²⁸ and it is but natural to suppose that they supported this practice by exactly such an ætiological consideration. Tradition does not sustain it, but perhaps some of the Arabicized Jews also performed the pilgrimage thither. Muḥammad could not have uttered such a perverted tradition without the risk of being branded by the People of the Book as an insane man or a most unscrupulous liar. Now Muḥammad might have been indiscreet in flaunting subjective falsehoods, but he was certainly wise enough not to fabricate what might be called an objective lie. Thus when he made Abraham lay the foundations of the Ka'ba, he probably reiterated what already had been a recognized tradition with some sects in Arabia. But how did this strange tradition originate after all? Ishmael is represented in the Bible as an Arab prince, but Abraham is never mentioned there as having visited Arabia. Nor do later Jewish²⁹ or Christian reports connect Abraham with that country. In order to solve the problem, we must involve the Samaritans in the investigation. The mount of Moriah, to which Abraham was commanded to bring his son as an offering, is in Jewish and Christian sources the site predestined to bear the Temple,³⁰ while according

²⁸ Snouck Hurgronje, *Het Mekkaansche Feest*, p. 28.

²⁹ In *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* (Chap. xxx) Abraham is spoken of as having visited his son Ishmael in the desert, but since 'Ā'isha and Fāṭima are mentioned there as the wives of Ishmael, the passage is of course post-Amoraic and no doubt a product of Muslim tradition [G.].

³⁰ Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 253, n. 253.

to the Samaritans mount Moriah is no other than mount Gerizim,⁸¹ and it was there that the erection of the Temple was preordained. Confronted with such conflicting aspects of the tradition, the Arabs—and by the Arabs I mean some of the pagan Arabs, Jewish Arabs, and Christian Arabs—grew emboldened to tamper with it too, and in their eagerness to mold a national religion, shifted the scene to Mecca. And although nothing is said in the Qur'ān regarding the sacrifice at the time Abraham and his son were dedicating the Ka'ba, the parallelism of the three accounts is nevertheless not destroyed, owing to the concomitant and no less important consideration that in all three of them both father and son are involved. Now both patriarchs must perforce figure in the Biblical story, but why should two founders be mentioned in connection with the Ka'ba? One could have discharged his duties without the help of the other, and thus fit even more into the rôle of a founder by virtue of his being alone. So that the principals thus paired are none other than the surviving human framework of the story of the sacrifice which Muḥammad or his precursors could not preserve in connection with the Temple-site tradition, which was also modified by them in other respects. For why indeed should Isaac's sacrifice be transferred to Arab soil, if he were not an Arab ancestor or Bedouin chief? Not only would national fancy not crave such an allocation, but would even consider it grotesque. On the other hand, Ishmael could not very well have been made to step into the rôle of Isaac, for unlike the disputed situation of the altar, there was no difference of opinion among the *Ahl al-Kitāb*—Jews, Christians, and Samaritans alike—as to who was to be sacrificed. (Of course later tradition does substitute Ishmael for Isaac, but this at a time when the opinions of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* are no longer taken into account.) With no encouragement from local tradition to substitute the personage, the sacrifice-motif was altogether dropped in connection with the

⁸¹ Cowley, *Samaritan Liturgy*, p. 344 and p. 512; *Ibrahīm ibn Ya'qūb's commentary on Genesis*, Cod. Adler 1603 and 1604, in the possession of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The reference to Gerizim as the mountain on which Isaac was to be sacrificed is found on p. 229 and p. 336 of Cod. 1603. I am indebted to Professor Alexander Marx for placing the MSS. at my disposal.

Temple-site tradition, and *faute de mieux* Ishmael was assigned the part of an auxiliary in the dedication ceremonies. And so the function of father and son at Mecca, though spun out of thin air, contains nothing to contradict the Bible in explicit or glaring fashion. Since Abraham in his journeyings consecrated more than one place of worship, could he not consecrate one in Arabia as well? This would be a plausible argument, skilfully masking as it does the true genesis of the founding tradition. To advance the claim that Abraham was commanded to sacrifice both sons would be a ridiculous and an abortive gesture. The account could best take root as recorded in the Qur'an, and so indeed it did.

But have we sufficient proof to presuppose the existence of the Samaritans in the peninsula before and during the time of the Prophet? Of Samaritans living there we hear nothing. The story told by Abū'l-Fath³² that a noted Samaritan had met Muḥammad and concluded a treaty with him on behalf of the former's coreligionists has all the earmarks of a legend. Of historical value, however, is his report³³ that Baba Rabba, the great Samaritan leader of the fourth century A.D., had cleared Samaria of Arab invaders. Also Zachariah of Mitylene³⁴ speaks of a battle between Samaritans and Arab mercenaries in Neapolis in A.D. 538. But it stands to reason that if contact came through war, it might also have come through peaceful relations, especially since both peoples were not so far apart, and great numbers of Arabs were engaged in the Roman service, and their trading caravans were making regular trips to Syria. We could hardly expect a chronicler to record conversations between Samaritans and Saracens in the streets of Neapolis, but they undoubtedly did take place, and may have touched *inter alia* also upon matters of religious concern. Even *a priori* it is therefore reasonable to claim for the Samaritans a share in the contribution toward the birth of Islām. It is true that their numbers were not great, but their migration to the peninsula must have been extensive, because they were persecuted by both Jews and Romans. And perhaps it was this mass influx

³² *Annales Samaritains*, pp. 173-5.

³³ *ibid.*, pp. 136-7.

³⁴ Land, *Anecdota*, Vol. III, p. 262; *The Syriac chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene*, translated by Hamilton and Brooks, pp. 231-2.

into Arabia that more than anything else depleted their numbers at home. And besides, could not the disappearance of the "Lost Ten Tribes," the proto-Samaritans, be better accounted for, if we assume that multitudes of them sought refuge in Arabia, which was a haven for many religions? An ingress of this kind could have been of vast dimensions, and the religious influence it exerted might have been immense.

Gaster in his article "Samaritans" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* has attempted to prove the influence which Samaritanism exercised over Islām. While imaginative, resourceful, and ingenious, and gifted with rare insight into the general problem, he yet fails to establish an adequate basis for his individual contentions. In his excessive enthusiasm he is often too emphatic about his statements, and treats the items he investigates one-sidedly. This makes the argument appear plausible for a while, but this impression is lost as soon as we look at the comparison from more than one angle. Thus we cannot positively state that the *Basmala* resulted from the Samaritan יהוה בשם (Deut. xxxii: 3) as opposed to the Massoretic שם יהוה, for there are many cases in which בשם יהוה does occur in the Massoretic Bible. השליח, analogous to رسول in the Qur'ān, may be a standing epithet in Samaritan literature, but this in itself does not yet establish a dependence between the two terms, for the Old Testament and the New Testament (John xvii: 3) also speak of God and His apostle. The similarity between רחום הרחומים and الرحمن الرحيم is only superficial, for רחום is in construct relation to הרחומים—cf. the expression עבד עבדים (Gen. ix: 25)—while الرحمن is appositive to الرحيم. Besides, רחום and رحمن are two distinct forms. The comparison between לית אלה אלא אחד ולא נביא אלא משה ברה דעמרם and the Muḥammadan confession of faith would be more striking, if we had הוּא instead of אחד.³⁵ However, the analogy is enticing, for לית אלה אלא אחד is not a phrase occurring once or twice, but a formula repeated over and over again by Marqah, 'Amram Dara and Nana, all of them authors antedating Muḥammad by *circa* three centuries. The resemblances between the *Enṣira* and the *Fātiḥa* are too

³⁵ Munk, *Des Samaritaner's Marqah Erzählung über den Tod Moses*, p. 10.

slight to justify considering the former as the pattern of the latter, or having in any way exerted an influence on it. Finally, we must own that Gaster's assertion that the Samaritans "were the first to accuse the Jews of tampering with the Holy Scriptures, an accusation which was afterwards taken up by the Christians, Muḥammadans, and the Gnostic sects" carries great weight. All historical considerations point to the Samaritans as the originators of the textual controversy, and as the ones likely to have encouraged in this respect subsequent antagonists of the Jews, but this does not mean that they have directly bequeathed this manner of disputation upon the Muḥammadans.

Examples in the above vein can be multiplied, but the evidence of course will be just as inconclusive. Sometimes the resemblance seems unique, but rash inferences should be avoided. Cf. for instance the Samaritan passage⁸⁶ בוראו העולם מן האן דלא הואה with the Qur'ānic *إم خلقوا من غير شيء* (sūra lii: 35). To regard בוראו, etc., as the source of *إم*, etc., is very tempting indeed, but the former expression is post-Muḥammadan, and thus the reverse may be the case. Moreover, *ὅτι αὐτὸ ἐξ ὧν ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός*⁸⁷ of 2 Maccab. vii: 28 makes the Samaritan origin of the Qur'ānic phrase even more doubtful. Walker,⁸⁸ however, seems to be on the right track when he says that the Qur'ānic statement *The Jews say 'Uzair (= Ezra) is the son of God* (sūra ix: 30) is a "slandrous accusation against the Jews made by enemies, perhaps the Samaritans, who hated Ezra most bitterly because he changed the sacred law and its script." In like manner we may argue that the mentioning of the *Sāmīrī* in sūra xx: 87, 90, 96 as the maker of the golden calf is a malevolent indictment of the Samaritans on the part of the Jews, who must have fantastically connected the calumny with Jeroboam's golden calves (1 Kings xii: 28) or with the "calf of Samaria" (Hos. viii: 5-6). Marqah's phrase *אתפדה באל*⁸⁹ corresponds to the Qur'ānic *وفديناه بذبح* (sūra xxxvii:

⁸⁶ Heidenheim, *Samaritanische Liturgie*, p. 54.

⁸⁷ The thought is implied in *Midrash Genesis Rabba*, Chap. I, § 12, Warsaw ed. [G].

⁸⁸ *Bible Characters in the Koran*, p. 49; cf. also his article in the *Moslem World*, July 1929, pp. 303-6: "Who is 'Uzair?"

⁸⁹ Heidenheim, *Der Commentar Marqah's*, p. 46.

107). Jewish and Christian sources do not employ the term פְּדָה in connection with the sacrifice, and apparently for a good reason. I had occasion to discuss this point fully in a previous paper.⁴⁰ Suffice it here to say that ransoming would have insinuated that Isaac was a votive offering, an inference which both Jews and Christians sought to avoid. The Qur'ānic phrase seems thus to have been based upon the Samaritan, or else both are independent ramifications of an earlier tradition of northern Israel. Finally, if we assume that Belial is Iblīs, there is a strong possibility that the Arabs borrowed the name from the Samaritans, for while Belial and Iblīs may have many general traits in common, the former does not appear in Paradise or in the early history of the world, an outstanding characteristic of the latter. With the Samaritans, however, Belial is the evil one who tempted Eve.⁴¹

But there is one passage in the Qur'ān which perhaps more than any other in that book points to the presence of the Samaritans in the peninsula and to Muḥammad's acquaintance with their doctrines and traditions, and that is "And Solomon was not an unbeliever, but the satans were infidels, teaching men magic" (sūra ii: 96). This defense of Solomon's piety and divine power could not be directed against anyone but the Samaritans, who denounced Solomon as "born of a harlot" (Bath-Sheba) and as "an enchanter like Balaam"⁴² and as one "rebellious and straying from the way of truth."⁴³ While it is true that the Mandaeans speak of Solomon as becoming puffed up with pride and, as a result, deprived of his rule,⁴⁴ this can nevertheless not be construed as an accusation falling in line with the malignant invectives of the Samaritans. It is rather akin to the Jewish, Christian, and Qur'ānic accounts of the king's sins and his subsequent downfall. Certainly Mandaean tradition could not regard Solomon as a thoroughly wicked and reprobate ruler, if out of the

⁴⁰ *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 1931, pp. 12-13 and pp. 19-21. Reprint in the *Moslem World*, April 1932, pp. 174-5.

⁴¹ Gaster, *Asatir*, p. 97: "I have discovered that this name [Belial] is used by the Samaritans for the designation of the Evil One who tempted Eve."

⁴² *ibid.*, p. 308.

⁴³ *ibid.*, p. 287.

⁴⁴ Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 28.

thousand years which it assigned to his reign it accorded to him a hundred in heaven.⁴⁵ Nor did Jewish sources condemn him to perdition, disobedient to God though he was. *Sanhedrin* 103b speaks of Ahaz, Ahaziah and all the kings of Israel concerning whom the Bible employs the words "and they did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord," as having no share in the world to come. Here the "kings of Israel" are significantly stressed in order to exclude Solomon from the class of impious kings, though in his case too it is written that he "did that, etc." (1 Kings xi: 6).⁴⁶ The gist of the other Rabbinic stories dealing with this topic is that some judicial authorities, at one time or another, contemplated Solomon's damnation, but that supernatural intervention prevented them from rendering the scathing decision. A *bat qōl* is said to have admonished them by exclaiming: "Touch not Mine anointed ones" (Ps. cv: 15), or else to have indirectly warned them by means of a Biblical verse containing a laudatory allusion to Solomon.⁴⁷ Rabbi Jonathan avers:⁴⁸ "He who says that Solomon has sinned is mistaken." Since, however, he repeats the same statement with regard to David and Josiah,⁴⁹ it is evident that he is thus contravening not an opinion which sentences Solomon to eternal punishment, but merely one which, in contradistinction to his own exonerating view, does not minimize Solomon's transgressions by means of special interpretation, but imputes to him a pardonable sin. Only in such light can the view opposed by Rabbi Jonathan be regarded, for otherwise we would have to assume that it adjudged also David and Josiah to be deprived of their future state, a supposition which of course is inconceivable.

But it might be rightly argued that the judges' intention in the *bat qōl* story, though not universally sanctioned, yet reflects a suppressed minority opinion of absolute condemnation. This is quite true, but when we come to analyze the charges as set forth in the story and in the Qur'ān we find that though both are equally serious in effect, their ground is nevertheless not at all identical. In the former the accusation is based upon Solomon's

⁴⁵ Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 411.

⁴⁶ Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. VI, pp. 294-5, n. 59.

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, p. 295, n. 59.

⁴⁸ *Shabbat* 56b.

⁴⁹ *ibid.*, 56a and 56b.

sins mentioned in the Bible, and in the latter upon the fact that, instead of submitting to God in quest of His help, he defiantly relied upon his black art wherewith to accomplish his designs, an accusation for a trace of which we look in vain in the Scriptures or subsequent Jewish or Christian writings. For what can the Qur'ānic passage "And Solomon was not an unbeliever, but the satans were infidels, teaching men magic" mean but that Solomon in gaining control of the satans did not thereby become a sorcerer trusting in his own power and renouncing his allegiance to God, but, on the contrary, considered the Jinn's subservience to him as a mark of divine favor? Moreover, he did not divulge to men the secret of his power, so that they do not abuse it in their unworthy ways. Not he, therefore, but the devils are to blame for teaching mankind magic spells. The indictment of which Muḥammad endeavors to clear Solomon perfectly tallies with that of the Samaritans. Indeed the passage in Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb's commentary on Genesis⁵⁰ which I herewith translate sounds as if it paraphrased the implied accusation in the Qur'ān, to wit: ". . . until there arose from the tribe of Judah a man called Shiloh, i.e. Sulaiman, in fulfilment of the verse 'until Shiloh will come' (Gen. xlix: 10) . . . and he [Solomon] laid the foundation of the various types of magic, and persistently indulged in prohibited practices, and displayed to his followers wonders and signs concerning which the lawgiver declared that they must not be believed in. And one who does put faith in them falls under the spell of sin, as it is said 'turn ye not unto the *Elilim*' (Lev. xix: 4). God alone has the knowledge of hidden affairs, to wit: 'The secret things belong to YHWH our God.' In the Mosaic law the Hebrews are time and again interdicted these practices."

. . . الى ان قام من سبط يهوذا الرجل المسمى שלה اي سليمان لقوله עד כי⁵⁰ יבוא שלה... ואשס פואד האבוא הנאנכה ואנהם פבא לא יכור פלה ופזפר למן תבעוה איות ומעגזות אבאן לנא الشارع بعدم تصדיקה ומן صدק בהא וקע תחת דרכ הטהא לקולה אל תפכו אל האלילים וללה נעאל עמ החפיות לקולה הכסתרות ליהוה אלהינו. وهذه المعاملات حرمت على الملة الاسرائيلة مرارا في; النيرانכה = النانכה . نارانج Evidently the corruption resulted from analogy with الشريعة MS. 1604, Adler collection, p. 357.

Not only from the above instance, but from the trend and tenor of the Qur'ān as a whole, it may be seen that Muḥammad (or Arabia) has never regarded Samaritanism as the fountain of Old Testament traditions to be here and there supplemented, if necessity dictated, by those current among the Jews, or vice versa. He drew freely from both sides and gave priority to neither. To him they were simply two factions of the *Yahūd*, notwithstanding the fact that the Samaritans would abhor such a label. Of the doctrines and traditions of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* those were the truest that served his purpose best. Why therefore worry about the Samaritan repudiation of David and Solomon? The exploits of these two heroes were a great propaganda asset to him. With the latter's rôle of subjugating the Jinn, and the former's dual part of warrior and receiver of the *Zabūr*, he identified his own, and by intertwining his teachings with some accounts of their lives, he hoped that the identification might dawn upon his audience as well. On the other hand, it is quite probable that the glorious deeds of the two kings, so admirably fulfilling the Arab conception of heroism and leadership, had taken hold of the imagination of Muḥammad's countrymen long before his mission. With him therefore it was not so much a question of rejecting or accepting novel information, as that of being the eloquent expounder of already established traditions.

G. WALTER FISKE

*Professor of Practical Theology and Religious
Education, Graduate School of Theology,
Oberlin, Ohio*

MODERN OBJECTIVES IN RELIGIOUS
EDUCATION

MODERN OBJECTIVES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By G. WALTER FISKE

THE religious education movement is very definitely under fire. It is facing criticism both within and without the church. Several surveys, sociological and educational, have reported that the moral influence of the Sunday school is in general neutral; that years of Sunday-school attendance do not make boys more honest or produce reliable character. Within the church the movement is between two fires. Conservative Sunday schools are accused of violating educational principles, and modernist Sunday schools are accused of ignoring religious motivation, of focusing on character education and neglecting religion.

Though here and there these criticisms are in a measure true, the past generation has seen real progress in religious education. There are, to be sure, tens of thousands of Sunday schools, like the public schools in the same communities, that show little evidence of progress; but progressive church schools have to a large extent taken over from the field of general education many new ideals of organization and educational practices that cannot fail to bear fruit in the next generation.

At this juncture nothing is more important in religious education than a clarifying of objectives. There has been much wasted effort and well-meaning but inefficient service because so many church schools have listlessly perpetuated the program and the blunders of past decades, without ever asking the question Why? In the past five years leaders in the movement have been making a re-study of aims and objectives of religious education, with a view to revising the whole process of teaching religion and of acquiring a Christian character and experience. Thousands of churches and their leadership need to clear up in their minds what religious education is really aiming at and what it must accomplish. That is the purpose of this chapter.

The scope of our subject is not to be limited to the Sunday school. It is as wide as the teaching of religion, including, of

course, the teaching function of the pulpit. Many branches of the church are slow in discovering that the chief functional process of the church is not inspirational but educational. The ancient church, through centuries of experience, learned the necessity of routinizing her children in the technic of Catholic worship and all religious duties. Even though many of the exercises involved little thought or understanding, faithful Catholics early became habituated to the practices of the church. It was an effective process of education, motivated as it was by the emotional power of the Mass with its subtle mystery and powerful appeal to religious loyalty.

In the days of the great Reformation the leaders were equally conscious of the need of religious education as a cardinal necessity for an intelligently loyal church. Founded, as it was, on doctrine, the Protestant church must teach to live. It must indoctrinate its children. Hence the great emphasis on the catechism. That the catechetical method helped to conserve the results of the Reformation cannot be denied; but as a permanent method of teaching children, it failed because of ignorance of child psychology. We know now that children cannot understand concepts; and a catechism consists of nothing else, just doctrinal formulae, pure abstractions, wholly beyond the reach of child experience.

As the futility of the catechetical method became evident, mainly through the passive resistance of the children it persecuted, the revival method of winning discipleship and recruiting church membership became the chief emphasis of most Protestant churches. It not only made evangelistic preaching the chief concern of the evangelical pulpit, but it also gave the eighteenth and nineteenth century Sunday schools their main objective. Both pulpit and Sunday school, for a long period, were inspirational rather than educational. Neither was concerned with teaching religion. In fact they would have denied that it was possible to teach religion. Teaching in those days was only instruction. One might teach the Bible; and one might "get" religion. The religious experience, especially in Calvinistic zones, must be patiently, passively received, as the gift of the Holy Spirit. With the waning of Calvinistic fatalism, evangelistic fervor increased, and revivals thrived; but still no effort was made to teach religion. Inspira-

tion, not education, was held to be the high function of the church. Loyalty to the Bible led an army of Sunday-school teachers to teach the Bible, but still the underlying purpose of it all was evangelistic. Children were to learn the Bible facts in order to bring them more surely under the power of the Spirit in some future revival. Thus the knowledge-of-the-Bible aim and the evangelistic aim went hand in hand through the last century as the chief objectives, and usually the only aims, of evangelical Sunday schools. Likewise the Protestant pulpits were usually more inspirational than educational, few pastors having the insight of Horace Bushnell, whose epoch-making book, *Christian Nurture* (Hartford, 1847), first taught our modern world that religion is really a process to be experienced and to be taught.

It is worth noting that the church of a century or even a half-century ago was no more backward than the school. They were products of about the same leadership. It was the modern child-study movement which brought fresh incentive and new objectives into both general education and religious education. As schoolmen discovered how children really learn, the fascinating ways of child-psychology dictated a revolution in teaching methods. Education gradually became socialized and humanized; hence vastly more interesting and more successful. Very tardily then the church caught up with the inspired insight of its great Master-Teacher, who, way back in the first century, had "put the child in the midst." Thus Christian education has become pupil-centered, experience-centered; and the development of Christian personality is seen to be a far broader objective and a more permanent one than the old evangelistic aim. Ample data are available to prove the transiency of revival results. The stimulation of the religious emotions by the "mob-psychology" method of the skilful revivalist is apt to be a passing experience unless supplemented by an educative process. Church members who have joined from the Sunday school have been much more permanent than the bulk of those who have come by the revival route.

We face then the definite challenge today, to teach religion. Any quibbling as to whether or not this is possible is merely a matter of definition. People who deny that religion can be taught are usually persons with the old viewpoint on both education

children, of their reaction to stimuli in varied situations, including internal states as well as external conduct, and in terms of purposeful pupil self-control.

With some such summary of teaching norms in mind, the representatives of forty-one great Protestant churches, gathered in 1928 at Jerusalem in an international missionary council, formulated this compact statement of teaching aims for Christian education: "Religious education aims to bring children and adults into a vital and saving experience of God revealed in Christ; to quicken the sense of God as a living reality, so that communion with Him in prayer and worship becomes a natural habit and principle of life; to enable them to interpret the meaning of their growing experience of life in the light of ultimate values; to establish attitudes and habits of Christian living in common life and in all human relations; and to enlarge and deepen the understanding of the historic facts on which Christianity rests and of the rich content of Christian experience, belief and doctrine."

Based largely on this statement, but going into far greater elaboration of detail, the International Council of Religious Education published, soon after, their seven-fold statement of objectives, involving nine pages of condensed paragraphs, in their bulletin entitled *The Development of a Curriculum of Religious Education* (revised 1930). Doctor Vieth, the chief collaborator in producing this statement, has since written a large volume on the subject, showing how vital a matter this is, as well as how it lends itself to endless elaboration and discussion. The limitations of the present chapter require a brief working statement of fundamental objectives. The International Council (Chicago) statement is obviously too elaborate for ordinary use, and the Jerusalem statement has been criticised as "clothed in vague generalities, and not specific enough to be very valuable or practical," though the present writer feels it is a noble expression of evangelical purpose, anchored firmly to the importance of sharing a genuine Christian experience with our youth. But it is obviously less interested in the social aim and the ethical aim, and is less concerned with educational technic, than the Chicago statement.

Realizing fully the difficulty of condensing in three short paragraphs what others have expanded to scores of pages, I offer the

following three-fold statement of the modern objective of Christian education:

A. The Christian Experience Objective.

The central aim of Christian education is to share with teachable persons that unique possession of Christianity, the religious experience of Jesus Christ.

B. The Christian Character Objective.

Inseparable from the former aim, and a constant test of its sincerity, is the purpose to foster in teachable persons a progressive development of Christlike character.

C. The Spiritualized Community Objective.

Christian education aims to train teachable persons to demonstrate the social principles of Jesus, in cooperation with their neighbors; thus building up a spiritualized, brotherly community, with a Christlike church at the heart of it; and by practising world-friendship, to extend this Christian social order, Christ's vision of the reign of God, throughout the world.

Let us expand these brief paragraphs a little.

A) Different churches will differ in the interpretation of these terms, but for all Christians our first statement will include Christ's vital communion with his Father-God, integrating his whole life and his universe, inspiring and motivating his ideals, and his own sense of incarnation and redemptive mission—all of which his followers may inherit, with his spiritually creative and redemptive power for growing Christian experience. The teacher who succeeds in sharing with his pupils this religious experience of Christ has succeeded in teaching the Christian religion, in its initial stages of personal relationship with God and Christ, and the acceptance of the Christian view of life and the universe. But we cannot stop at this beginning, important though it is.

B) The educative process of developing a Christlike character is accomplished not by mere imitation, but by incarnating afresh the Spirit of Christ and living again his attitudes, ideals, and principles; and by continuous reconstruction of daily experience thereby, under the teacher's guidance in making Christlike responses to changing situations, and with the constructive self-

activity which is truly creative living. We recognize the value of the character education technic, with its detailed study of areas of experience at each age-level, of desirable traits and character patterns, and of technics of conduct-control and habit-formation. But all this habituation process is comparatively futile without the motivation gained through worship and religious loyalty. Yet the failure to adopt this ethical aim with its technic for character training has been the great weakness of religious education in the past. No wonder our old-fashioned Sunday school, which was hardly a school at all, but a children's church, has had to be supplemented in many places by the new moral education plans of the public schools. The modern program of Christian education includes this great character objective, for we believe that secular education can never meet this responsibility alone.

C) Yet the winning of Christian experience and character is not enough. Both the social aims of modern education and the social religion of Jesus compel us to broaden our aims of Christian education to embrace the community and the world. We must teach our youth how to live in the Beloved Community in which social justice and social righteousness prevail. A more general use of the problem-project method of teaching is making our religious education program more socially effective and practical, and our attractive projects in world-friendship are giving it all a wide outreach of world-service.

It has become increasingly evident that Christian personality grows not simply by listening passively to preaching nor by instruction in the facts of the Bible, but by active participation in group activities and personal initiative in following the will of God. Hence the need of securing pupil activity at all costs. The educative process is not a passive one. Mere receptivity used to be a model student attitude, but it is so no longer, though many backward Sunday schools have not yet learned these facts. The great struggle still in this movement is between transmissive religious education and creative, dynamic religious education. In their enthusiasm for the latter, the radicals are declaring that there is no longer any place left for the former. Hence the Biblical content which used to be the sole staple of Christian education, is being neglected in the ultra-modern schools, and technic

is stressed enormously, at the sacrifice of content. This is obviously an extreme position. The great historical treasure of Hebrew and Christian traditions must not be so undervalued. The best of them must be passed on to enrich the life of future generations. Even modernists must admit that the religion of Jesus still has a message and a content, a faith and an altar which must be shared with our children. Let us not worship our modern technic at the expense of content. Transmissive religious education is by no means dead yet, and when the teachings, ideals and divine personality of the Christ are omitted from our educative process it ceases to be dynamic, at least for the building of Christian character.

The emphasis, however, must be placed on creative education. We must get away from the purely material-centered program. We have had sufficient proof of the inadequacy of even Bible knowledge to build up reliable Christian character. Knowledge alone is weak. The assimilation of facts in the mind does not necessarily mean the formation of noble habits of Christlike living. Effective teachers of religion guide the activities of the learner in meeting actual life situations and responding to them so as to reconstruct and enrich his experience, and thus furnish increased control to meet future emergencies of like nature. Such purposeful, whole-hearted projects in real living are creative educational experiences. They are vital experiences of vastly greater value than any passive experiences of listening to instruction could possibly be. Hence the importance of the project method in our modern program, for it gives maximum opportunity for enlisting the pupil's whole personality in an active learning process.

There is, however, no magic in mere method. Christian education is the integration of personality by Christlike ideals and loyalties. Good habits alone, without religious purpose at the heart of them, do not long survive the strain of temptation. The reason character education alone is not sufficient is because the old adage "practice makes perfect" does not hold in the moral realm. Without religious motivation the most correct ethics are on a precarious basis, the prudential basis of doing right merely because it pays, and as long as it pays. To be sure, right habits

help tremendously. The deeper the grooves of habit cut, the less likely the youth is to yield to temptation. But is the mechanism all there is to character? Certainly not. Character is an organized self, socially integrated and spiritually motivated. The purely moral mechanism fails to track when the motives that built up the mechanism fail to motivate it. If the good habits were formed to please a boy's teacher or father, what happens when the latter dies? We need a far stronger motivation than that. Hence Ellwood the sociologist says with strong conviction, "Social education is not enough. We must have religious social education." Unsupported by religious loyalties, character education is superficial.

We cannot discuss here with any thoroughness the question, When does education become religious? At least it may be said that the irreducible minimum in this religious factor in education is a God-consciousness and a belief in a God-centered universe, involving of course worship, and *training in worship*, to furnish motivation for character. This is why we believe that the most important process in the whole range of the Christian education program is training our children to worship. The Protestant churches are singularly lacking in worship technic. Perhaps it is not strange then that the average church school is noticeably irreverent. But the dawning of a better day has come. Many a new twentieth century sanctuary, built under the stress of the current movement for better worship in the evangelical churches, has built into the structure a chapel for the children, a little shrine of beauty, dignity and reverential atmosphere, where small groups and single classes or departments can be taken for a genuine worship experience in an ideal setting. Such training in worship is vastly needed, to add the deeper note of sincere reverence, in the felt presence of Almighty God, which alone can deepen the devotion and heighten the personal loyalty and consecration which the character of the modern young Christian needs to give lasting purpose, abiding motive and stability. To share such an experience with our children and youth is the ultimate privilege of those of us who would teach the religion of Jesus.

JOHN WILLIAM FLIGHT

*Department of Biblical Literature, Haverford
College, Haverford, Pennsylvania*

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROBLEM
OF SEMITIC ALPHABET ORIGINS

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROBLEM OF SEMITIC ALPHABET ORIGINS

By JOHN WILLIAM FLIGHT

THE present paper is the outgrowth of an interest in this subject which began during 1915-1916 when the writer was introduced to the field of Semitic epigraphy and paleography in the classroom of Professor Macdonald. Having maintained his initial interest in these fascinating subjects ever since, by constant study of the growing literature relating to them, the pupil feels impelled, by deep gratitude to his revered teacher, to offer this modest record of observations on certain phases of the complex problem of Semitic alphabet origins.

The natural starting point is to sketch briefly the general course which tradition and theory have followed in regard to the beginnings of the Phoenician alphabet. The work of detailed summary of the great number of theories which have obtained through the years has been too often done to require repetition here.¹

The literature dealing with our problem reveals the fact that the two most widely championed candidates for first place as

¹ Isaac Taylor, *The History of the Alphabet* (New York, 1899) and Edward Clodd, *The Story of the Alphabet* (New York, 1903) are the most extended works. J. P. Peters, "Notes on Recent Theories of the Origin of the Alphabet," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXII (first half, 1901, pp. 177-98, presents the best summary of the claims of various theories held to 1901. Briefer treatments, with emphasis on particular theories, are given by C. J. Ball, *Light from the East* (London, 1899), pp. 232-8; M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* (Giessen, 1902), Bd. I, pp. 109-36, 261-71; Arthur J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa* (Oxford, 1909), Vol. I, pp. 77-94; R. Stübe, *Der Ursprung des Alphabetes und seine Entwicklung* (Berlin, 1921); George Hempl, "The Genesis of European Alphabetic Writing," *Mediterranean Studies* (Stanford University, 1930), pp. 27-52; K. Sethe, "Die wissenschaftliche Bedeutung der Petrie'schen Sinaifunde und die angeblichen Moseszeugnisse," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, N.F., Vol. V (1926), pp. 24-54; B. L. Ullman, "The Origin and Development of the Alphabet," *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. XXXI (1927), pp. 311-28.

predecessors of the Phoenician alphabet have been the Egyptian hieroglyphic and the Mesopotamian cuneiform. Of these two, the Egyptian has held the field the longer and more continuously. Other theories include the Cretan, Cypriote, and Hittite, each of which has had but brief vogue, though held by some very reputable scholars.

Ancient tradition held to the Phoenician invention of letters. Herodotus, Diodorus, Pliny and other classical writers testify to this tradition.² But even this venerable tradition was questioned by certain writers who claimed that the Phoenicians derived the art of writing from the Egyptians.³

The scientific study of the problem cannot be said to have begun until the nineteenth century, when the first and most significant contribution was made by the French Egyptologist, Vicomte Emmanuel de Rougé.⁴ According to the de Rougé theory, the Phoenician alphabet was developed from the Egyptian hieratic script, which was in turn a cursive derivative of Egyptian hieroglyphic writing. The theory was so admirably presented that, until comparatively recently, when other forms of writing have become known from which the Phoenician may have been derived, it held the field almost uncontested.

Not long after de Rougé's work was published, proponents of the theory of cuneiform origin of the Phoenician alphabet arose to argue for the Assyrian or Babylonian descent of the Phoenician. The pioneer in this field was Dr. Deecke who in 1877 advanced the view that the Assyrian characters or their prototypes furnished the basis for the Phoenician alphabet.⁵ J. P. Peters in 1883 defended the Babylonian origin of the Phoenician, and shortly

² Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 73; Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

³ Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 82, where Eusebius is cited as quoting a Tyrian historian Sanchuniathon to the effect that the Phoenicians admitted the art of writing was obtained by them from Egypt. Plato, Plutarch, Tacitus, and others are said to have held this same view.

⁴ *Mémoire sur l'origine Égyptienne de l'alphabet Phénicien*, published Paris, 1874, though first announced in 1859. *cf.* Taylor's full treatment of this theory, of which he was an ardent supporter; *op. cit.*, pp. 88 f.

⁵ "Ursprung der altsemitischen aus der neuassyrischen Keilschrift," *Z.D.M.G.*, Vol. XXXI (1877), pp. 103 f.

thereafter he was followed by F. Hommel who also rallied to the support of the Babylonian theory.⁶

The discovery of the Tell el-Amarna correspondence in 1887, which showed the use of Babylonian cuneiform in Syria at about 1400 B.C., and in correspondence with Egypt, reawakened interest in the possible Babylonian relations of the Phoenician alphabet. At least, here was strong evidence for the cultural influence of Babylonia upon Syria, an influence which might well have furnished incentive for the development of Phoenician script from cuneiform. For the next decade or more the possibilities of the Babylonian theory were frequently discussed, support being given this theory by such eminent orientalistes as Haupt,⁷ Zimmern,⁸ Delitzsch,⁹ Peiser,¹⁰ C. J. Ball.¹¹ J. P. Peters, following Lidzbarski,¹² argued that the use of Babylonian cuneiform in Syria pointed to the probable non-existence of the Phoenician alphabet in 1400 B.C.

Meantime, Sir Arthur J. Evans was preparing another very promising theory of descent for the Phoenician alphabet from the Cretan linear script.¹³ As early as 1895 Evans had suggested that Minoan pictographic writing might have contributed toward the invention of the Phoenician alphabet.¹⁴ Evans' theory goes back ultimately to Egyptian rather than cuneiform connections, for he states elsewhere that the evolution of the Cretan hieroglyphic script was "aided by a knowledge of the existence of the highly developed Egyptian system."¹⁵

At about this same time, Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, on the basis of his Egyptian researches, was in process of formulating

⁶ *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens* (1885), pp. 54 f.

⁷ *Johns Hopkins Circulars*, Vol. VII, No. 64 (1888).

⁸ "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Alphabets," *Z.D.M.G.*, Vol. L (1896), pp. 667-70.

⁹ *Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems* (1897).

¹⁰ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. I, pp. 95 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 316 ff.

¹¹ *Light from the East* (1899), pp. 232-8.

¹² Peters, *op. cit.*, p. 179; cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, Vol. I, p. 110.

¹³ *Scripta Minoa*, Vol. I, pp. 77-94.

¹⁴ cf. his *Pictographs* (1895), pp. 95-7.

¹⁵ *Archaeological Report of the Egyptian Exploration Fund* (1899-1900), pp. 64-5.

his theory of the formation of the alphabet, a hypothesis differing from all that had gone before. First in 1900,¹⁶ and again in 1912,¹⁷ he advanced the view that out of "a wide body of signs . . . gradually brought into use in primitive time for various purposes," a "signary" arose, and was "spread by traffic far and wide," and was "slowly contracted and systematized until it was reduced to a fixed alphabet."

Neither Evans' nor Petrie's theory appealed to the majority of scholars as altogether satisfactory. Indeed, none of the attempts to link the Phoenician with any of the older systems of writing proved entirely convincing, since none revealed more than a few signs which might be called definitely related, either in form or name, between earlier systems and the Phoenician alphabet. As K. Sethe put it, the discussion became a matter of *tot capita tot sensus* and reached a "toten Punkt."

But the deadlock could not last, as able minds continued to grapple with the problem and new discoveries were bound to come to light. It was in 1915 that H. Schäfer¹⁸ pointed out that the non-vocalic nature of the Phoenician alphabet precluded the likelihood of linking it with the cuneiform which was vocalic. He was led therefore to conclude, on purely deductive grounds, that the prototype of the Phoenician was to be sought in the Egyptian rather than in the cuneiform. Shortly thereafter, K. Sethe set forth additional arguments denying the possibility of development of Phoenician from cuneiform.¹⁹

This brings us to the latest phase of investigation of the problem of alphabet origins, which really began with the discovery by Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, in 1904-1905, of certain fragments of inscriptions at the entrance of a mine at Serâbit el-Khâdem on the Sinai peninsula.²⁰ He was unable to identify the script, stating only that these were "inscriptions in unknown characters." The

¹⁶ *18th Memoir of the Egyptian Exploration Fund* (1900), "The Royal Tombs of the First Dynasty," pp. 31-2.

¹⁷ *The Formation of the Alphabet* (London, 1912).

¹⁸ H. Schäfer, "Die Vokallösigkeit des phönizischen Alphabets," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache* (1915).

¹⁹ K. Sethe, "Der Ursprung des Alphabets," *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft zu Göttingen* (1916), pp. 87-161.

²⁰ Petrie, *Researches in Sinai* (London, 1906), pp. 129 f.

result was that these fragments remained practically unnoticed for about ten years until 1916 when Dr. A. H. Gardiner divined what has since been amply confirmed as the correct solution, namely, that these "unknown characters," resembling Egyptian hieroglyphs yet unintelligible when treated as Egyptian writing, really represented a Semitic alphabet, the earliest yet known, employing the acrophonic principle.²¹ The story of this remarkable discovery has been too often told to require repetition here.²² Subsequent additions to the original find were made by the Harvard expedition of 1927, and the decipherment and interpretation of the inscriptions have called forth an extensive literature.²³ The most recent and complete treatment of the Serâbît inscriptions is contained in the *Harvard Theological Review* (Vol. XXV, 1932) where contributions are made by Professors Lake, Barrois, New, and Butin. From this symposium we learn that the conclusions of those who have been nearest to the study are substantially the following: the inscriptions date from the end of the nineteenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century, B.C.; the language is Old Semitic, but no assertion is hazarded as to the branch to which it belongs; the script is in imitation of the hieroglyphic, but does not seem to be a direct borrowing; the Phoenician script is connected with it, but whether as a direct descendant or a parallel development is doubtful.

The date, it will be noted, pushes back the known evidences for the beginnings of the Semitic alphabet fully five hundred years before the earliest previously known evidences. The question, however, of the exact relation of the Phoenician alphabet to the Serâbît inscriptions is left unsettled by Professor Butin and the Harvard group. Their caution is highly commendable in view

²¹ A. H. Gardiner, "The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. III (1916), pp. 1-16.

²² Gardiner, *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* (1929), pp. 48 f.; K. Lake, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXI (1928), pp. 1 f.; *ibid.*, Vol. XXV (1932), pp. 95 f.; A. E. Cowley, "The Sinaitic Inscriptions," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. XV (1929), pp. 200 f.; K. Sethe, *Z.D.M.G.*, Vol. LXXX (1926), pp. 24-9 (N.F., V).

²³ cf. bibliographies given in article by Leibovitch, *Z.D.M.G.*, Vol. LXXXIV (N.F., IX, 1930), pp. 2 f., and by Butin, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXV (1932), pp. 131-2.

of the fragmentary nature of the inscriptions, the lack of complete knowledge concerning the exact historical relations of the people involved, as well as the tendency of some other scholars to make premature guesses on the subject.

So far as an Egyptian source is claimed for the Serâbît inscriptions, it is not in the nature of direct appropriation (of elements from either hieratic or hieroglyphic, as de Rouge and Halévy had tried to prove) but rather, as Sethe suggests,²⁴ a use of the Egyptian alphabet as a "Vorbild," not an "Urbild." That is to say, "the Semites borrowed the idea of the alphabet, the principle of acrophony . . . and also most, if not all, of the signs; but they gave the signs a Semitic phonetic value and a Semitic name."²⁵

Leaving the subject of the Serâbît inscriptions for a moment, we turn to another remarkable discovery of an alphabet, this time in cuneiform characters, at Ras Shamra on the North Syrian coast, directly opposite the most easterly cape of Cyprus. The discovery was made by the French archeologists, F. A. Schaeffer and G. Chenet, in May 1929.²⁶ Thanks to the skilful work of P. Dhorme and H. Bauer,²⁷ the tablets were deciphered and found to represent the Phoenician-Hebrew alphabet, almost letter for letter; the language was Phoenician, but in a dialect differing from that of the Byblos inscriptions previously discovered further south. The date was at first supposed to be about the fourteenth century B.C., owing to the presence among the discoveries at Ras Shamra of letters of the type of the Amarna correspondence.²⁸ The final verdict, however, seems to be that, since this alphabet was found among Cypriote objects belonging to the late

²⁴ K. Sethe, "Neuentdeckte Sinai-Schrift und die Entstehung der semitischen Schrift," *Nachricht. der K. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen* (1917), pp. 454 f.

²⁵ Butin, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXI (1926), p. 28.

²⁶ cf. F. A. Schaeffer, *Syria*, Vol. X (1929), pp. 285-303; transcription of the forty-eight Ras Shamra tablets is given by Charles Viroilleaud, *ibid.*, pp. 304-10.

²⁷ Dhorme, *Revue Biblique*, Vol. XXXIX, (1930), pp. 571-7; *ibid.*, Vol. XL (1931), pp. 32-56; Bauer, *Z.D.M.G.*, Vol. LXXXIV (N.F., IX, 1930), pp. 251-4; Bauer, *Entzifferung der Keilschrifttafeln von Ras Schamra* (Halle, 1930).

²⁸ cf. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p. 575.

Mycenaean period, it therefore belongs to about the twelfth century B.C., thus coming after the Ahirom inscription from Byblos.

We have purposely omitted mention, until this point, of the brochure by Professor Sprengling on "The Alphabet, its Rise and Development from the Sinai Inscriptions,"²⁹ because this is the first study to appear in which the Serâbît and the Ras Shamra inscriptions are brought together for consideration. Since these two discoveries divide the field of alphabetic origins between indications of Egyptian and of cuneiform sources for the Phoenician alphabet, we may consider first of all the conclusions of the Chicago scholars on the relations of Serâbît and Ras Shamra.

Without reviewing the whole of their argument, we may set down briefly their conclusions, quoting only those passages which bear directly upon the subject of interrelations. "The Ras Shamra tablets . . . turn the Se'irite (Sinai) alphabet into actual cuneiform. . . . The Ras Shamra tablets were written in good Phoenician, for all practical purposes an earlier dialect of the biblical Hebrew. . . . Whatever doubt there may be as to the similarity of any given character in the cuneiform to its assumed prototype in the Sinaitic . . . the evidence as a whole would seem sufficient to prove that the one is borrowed from the other. Of quite equal significance is the fact that on the one hand the decipherment of the Sinaitic proves the essential accuracy of the decipherment of the Ras Shamra alphabet by Bauer and Dhorme and on the other the Ras Shamra alphabet proves the accuracy of the identification of Sinaitic characters by Professor Sprengling. . . . The fact that the close analogies are not with the Ahirom inscription, the Lachish ostrakon, or even the ostrakon from Gezer, cannot but excite our suspicion that the cuneiform alphabet was invented not long after the Sinaitic itself."³⁰

Professor Sprengling's discussion in this same section of the study has to do with the relations between the Se'irite and the South Arabic on the one hand and the Canaanite-Phoenician on

²⁹ Chicago, *Oriental Institute Communications*, No. 12, 1931, with an excursus on the cuneiform alphabet of Ras Shamra and its relation to the Sinaitic inscriptions, by Professor A. T. Olmstead, pp. 57-62.

³⁰ *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 58, 61, 62.

the other. From this discussion he concludes, concerning the South Arabic: "the southern characters . . . when placed side by side with their Se'irite forbears show unmistakably the lineaments of their origin"; and concerning the Canaanite-Phoenician: "It is not necessary to add anything further to demonstrate the fact that, and the manner in which, the Canaanite-Phoenician symbols developed directly from their Se'irite forbears found on Sinai"; and of both together: ". . . simple lines along which these two descendants derive directly, but separately, from the newly found and now solved Se'irite of Sinai."³¹

Professor Butin questions Sprengling's conjecture that the alphabet began at Se'ir and from there spread to the north, east, and south. "This," says Butin, "seems to me premature; the basis is very insecure, and if this view ever prevails it will be for reasons stronger than those so far advanced. Our documents do not allow us to establish the exact place of origin of the proto-Sinaitic alphabet with any certainty."³²

There has always been a tendency, nay a temptation, for students of this subject to overestimate the importance of certain factors and to leap to abortive conclusions. J. P. Peters already in 1901 cautioned against placing too much weight on similarities in the forms of letters of various alphabetic systems in order to establish the relationships between the systems.³³ He showed also that a somewhat more dependable argument can be made on the basis of resemblance between letter-names (where the names are known). Order of arrangement of letters has also been employed as a criterion to establish relationships between systems.³⁴ But in view of the frequent failures of the foregoing criteria to furnish permanent results, the most reliable basis, though assuredly the most difficult to achieve, would seem to lie in a knowledge of the exact historical relations which existed among the peoples employing the various scripts in question. On this matter

³¹ *op. cit.*, pp. 54, 62-3.

³² *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXV (1932), p. 155.

³³ *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXII (first half, 1901), p. 191.

³⁴ *cf.* Peiser, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. I, pp. 95 f.; Vol. II, pp. 316 f. *cf.* also Taylor, *The Alphabet*, p. 77.

our knowledge is, of course, still somewhat scanty, but successive archeological discoveries are continually filling in the gaps. But until we can be more certain of the precise relations, commercial and diplomatic contacts, mingling of speech and cultures, among all the peoples of the second millennium B.C., we shall have to exercise due caution in adducing whatever evidences the inscriptions themselves may yield.

Another field of speculation which has often been explored is anent the question of invention versus gradual growth of the alphabet. Did some ancient genius, some "man of Canaan,"³⁵ deliberately invent the signs, albeit from some model which suggested the system to him? Or, as Petrie held, did the alphabet result from a gradual process of selection from great numbers of signs, or a "signary"? It is difficult for the modern mind, accustomed as it is to individual invention in many fields, to imagine anything but the same circumstance governing the origin of the alphabet. Thus Ullman says: "It has been assumed . . . that [the alphabet] was the invention of a single individual simply because no other explanation seems possible."³⁶ And it is true that the latest evidence, in the Serâbît inscriptions, would seem to confirm Lidzbarski's conjecture of thirty years ago. But it must be remembered that even this earliest evidence does not furnish us with the actual inception of the alphabet, but only a way-mark, a development from something still earlier. In any case we are here not yet back to the point of "invention by a single individual" except as we assume the fact.

Then there is the question as to whether the earliest use of the alphabet was for monumental purposes or for the more practical purpose of convenience in the course of trade and communication. Concerning the Serâbît inscriptions, this particular alphabet, the earliest yet discovered, may have originated in the attempt on the part of a "native foreman" to keep his own records, perhaps first on more perishable material than stone; then, later, his signs were utilized in the making of such stone inscriptions as were

³⁵ M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, Vol. I, pp. 134, 261.

³⁶ B. L. Ullman, "The Origin and Development of the Alphabet," *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. XXXI (1927), p. 321.

found at Serâbît.³⁷ This is a plausible conjecture, but it reduces us to hopelessness in the matter of ever finding the perishable materials on which the original essays at alphabet construction were made. Perhaps this is the *ne plus ultra* of all research into the problem of alphabetic origins! As to the monumental usage of the Serâbît alphabet, Butin's suggestion that the stelae found in and near the mines of Sinai may have been "rejects, discarded and sometimes defaced because they were not considered good enough"³⁸ makes us hopeful that the accepted originals may yet be discovered in their proper places.

The final question raised by the Serâbît and Ras Shamra discoveries is that of the relation of these two alphabets to each other, and of both to the Phoenician. Professor Dhorme early stated his opinion that the Ras Shamra alphabet was created "by men who were accustomed to the cuneiform, but who felt the necessity of reproducing the consonants of their own language, namely, the Phoenician."³⁹ He adds his belief that this alphabet may have been effected on the spot and was not widely spread, remaining confined to the northernmost part of Phoenicia.

Professors Olmstead and Sprengling venture further, as has been noted, and supply valuable and suggestive materials for a reconstruction of the historical relationships of the peoples employing these two alphabets. Their argument on the point in question is based for the most part, however, upon similarity of form between corresponding characters in the two alphabets. So far as this argument is concerned, one can see as much evidence for the derivation of certain Ras Shamra characters from the Canaanite-Phoenician as from the Se'irite-Sinaitic.⁴⁰

³⁷ Sprengling, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

³⁸ *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXI (1928), p. 67.

³⁹ *Revue Biblique*, Vol. XXXIX (1930), p. 575.

⁴⁰ Consulting Sprengling's table on p. 55 of his study, one can detect as great possibilities of likeness (indicating borrowing?) between characters 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 20 in the columns headed "Canaanite-Phoenician" and "Ras Shamra Cuneiform" as Professor Sprengling notes between characters 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 17, 19, 20 in the columns marked "Se'irite-Sinaitic" and "Ras Shamra Cuneiform." In either case, we have a total of nine, at most, out of twenty-two characters.

Reckoning by the probable dates of the scripts, one theory of borrowing is about as good as another, for doubtless every script went through a longer or shorter period of development, and our documents give no clue to the actual duration of these periods. Here again, definitive proof of relationship among the various scripts will be forthcoming only when more of the lacunae in our present knowledge of the peoples employing the scripts are filled in. We need to know more about the interchanges of ideas, customs, etc., with the resulting effects upon the speech and writing of the peoples who mingled in the highly syncretistic civilization of the Syrian littoral during and preceding the period represented by the Ras Shamra discoveries. There were Aegean, Hittite, Egyptian, Babylonian, and possibly pure Phoenician elements playing upon one another here.⁴¹

Until more material similar to the Ras Shamra alphabet is found in Syria or elsewhere, the Ras Shamra alphabet will doubtless be regarded as a purely local phenomenon, as Dhorme suggests. The model used for its formation remains still uncertain. In spite of hitherto unavailing efforts to identify the model, we may yet find that the Ras Shamra alphabet represents a reproduction, by men accustomed to clay, stylus and cuneiform, of a script which was already in local or general use, possibly coming originally from the region of Sinai and passing through such intermediate stages as are suggested by the Gezer potsherd, the Bliss fragment of Tell el-Hesi, the Grant (Beth Shemesh) ostrakon⁴² and other yet undiscovered scripts. Into the development of that script may have entered contributions from Cretans, Aegean peoples, Hittites and others who, mingling with the Phoenicians, added each a share to its completion.

Basically the proposition appears unassailable that Egypt furnished the principle, originally, upon which Semites constructed the alphabet. And this is not too far from the ancient tradition that "the Phoenicians derived the art of letters from Egypt" to make it appear that the tradition had been well founded.

⁴¹ As Dr. J. P. Naish points out in *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* (July 1932), p. 154.

⁴² E. Grant, *Revue Biblique*, Vol. XXXIX (1930), pp. 401-2.

ELIHU GRANT

*Professor of Biblical Literature, Haverford College,
Haverford, Pennsylvania; Director of the
Haverford Archeological Expeditions*

EXCAVATIONS AND THEIR RESULTS
AT AIN SHEMS

EXCAVATIONS AND THEIR RESULTS AT AIN SHEMS*

By ELIHU GRANT

H AVERFORD COLLEGE (Pennsylvania) has, recently, added to its record of interest in Biblical and oriental studies certain field expeditions in Palestine. These have excavated during four seasons (1928-1931) on the mound known locally as Rumeileh at Ain Shems which is about twenty miles due west of Jerusalem at the edge of the Shephelah, or lower hill-country.

This tell (ruin-mound) has been confidently recognized as the site of ancient Beth Shemesh (I. Sam. vi, *passim*) ever since the researches made by Edward Robinson. It is situated on the west side of the Jaffa-Hebron road, across from the semi-abandoned country mosque Wely Abu Meizar.

The hill is low and oval, terraced slightly, especially on the south, west, and north. It commands a good view of the sea plain and the Mediterranean. It is in the angle made by the confluence of two valleys, the larger the Wady Surar (Sorek) coming from the east along the northern side and the smaller the Wady Bulus (Paul) coming from the south and swinging gently westward and slightly north to join the larger valley. Wheat and barley lands surround the hill and run over its top which is of mellow soil, largely débris and decomposed limerock.

The hill is plentifully sprinkled with sherds of post-Christian era, often called Coptic-Arabic. These have a greasy, painted slip of light creamy tone and are decorated with brown or red lines somewhat geometric in style. Now and then one comes across sherds of the late Israelite period on the surface but almost continuous farming of the soil of the hilltop, through many centuries, yes millennia, has mellowed the ground and destroyed many fragments. During the same time much stone ready dressed for build-

* This article was completed in the summer of 1932 [ED.].

ing purposes has probably been lifted while smaller stone has been gathered out. Even today the peasants are keen to secure the dressed blocks of long ago as they are loosened from any remaining structural walls, and it takes constant vigilance to prevent the complete removal of walls and old buildings. The result has been a hilltop of easily tilled ground which makes correspondingly easy work for modern excavators.

The amount of soil débris, ruins, etc., above the original bed-rock surface of the hill turns out to be about eighteen to twenty feet depth. This varies, naturally, over the surface in different parts.

Seven separate seasons of work have been undertaken by excavators during the six years 1911, 1912, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, and about half of the hill is known archeologically as the result of their efforts. The parent society in Palestine Excavations, the Palestine Exploration Fund of London ("P.E.F.") prosecuted three of these during years preceding the World War. The Haverford expeditions fell heir to the privilege of exploring the contents of the mound by courtesy of the Fund and of the government of Palestine, Department of Antiquities, whose director has made the way clear to continue the work in the four years 1928-1931. Haverford elected to open trenches at the extreme west of the hill and to work eastward toward the trenches and débris of the P.E.F. Preliminary reporting of these later campaigns has been done in the *Quarterly* of the P.E.F., in the *Annals* of the American Schools of Oriental Research, in a volume published at Haverford in 1929, *Beth Shemesh, Progress of the Haverford Archaeological Expedition* ("B.S."), and in *Ain Shems Excavations*, Part I ("A.S."), Haverford 1931, Part II, Haverford 1932 (in press). It is expected that further parts of this official report will appear. The present article is an attempt to sum the results of scientific work in connection with the site.

It may be said at once that the main results are naturally confirmatory of our knowledge of southern Canaan during the two millennia just preceding the Christian era. Gezer, notably, also Tell el Hesi, Tell Zachariyeh, Tell Sandahannah, and Tell Beit Mirsim have done very much to clear up certain problems relating

to the life of ancient Canaan in the Shephelah and to the west and south of that natural defensive secondary wall of Judah.

Beth Shemesh, if we may now use the ancient name instead of the modern Arabic designation of Ain Shems or Rumeileh, was an ancient aspirant for control of the trade roads between Egypt and Palestine-Syria. Its name shows its cultural pretensions as honoring the Sun-deity under the ancient Semitic name Shemesh. Here we have the House of the Sun, City of the Sun, Clients of the Sun-deity with temples and cult objects of various kinds. The competitor or consort in the realm of natural forces was the goddess of fertility, Astarte, the mother goddess of the Near East. Of her there were figurines, plaques, symbols, dove, and gazelle. Beth Shemesh was the center of the worship and benefactions of this great nature force of creativity, fructifying, destructive, ever to be revered and feared, honored. We found one such temple with signs of various stages of its building and use and remains of important structures pertaining to it. In the temple were remains of pillar bases running from the western front toward the adytum. A fragmentary incense burner stand was picked up in the ruins and assembled (see *B.S.*, p. 103), also a seal cylinder (*B.S.*, p. 97) with various other objects (*B.S.*, p. 107). All of this lore may be gathered or surmised from the Old Testament records. What have modern excavations done to make the ancient life more clear to our view?

The Haverford campaign of 1928 cut a quadrant in the southwest of the walled area of the old town. An important portion of these Shephelah towns of southern Canaan would look toward the caravan routes and Egypt. Our selection was fortunate also in that it permitted us three campaigns of contiguous effort before we came near the edge of the pre-war work of the P.E.F. and such difficulties as would naturally ensue in linking the remains and cartography of independent expeditions sixteen years apart.

By continuing the eastern boundary of this sector to the north in 1929, and by adding a long narrow trench eastward of that eastern line in 1930, a substantial exploration of the entire western end of Rumeileh was possible. This unit is mapped out on plans which are included in the first part of the official report *Ain Shems Excavations* (Haverford, 1931).

In the spring of 1931 the work went on at a very different part of the ruins, north and west of the Byzantine monastery.

It is convenient at first to treat as a unit the main discoveries in the area uncovered in the first three Haverford seasons. Four main levels of the city's life in ancient times were reached. The phases and shadings of age to age are sometimes left in relics which belong to the transition periods between these ages, but for clearness we may refer to the Middle Bronze, Late Bronze, Early Iron First Phase, Early Iron Second Phase, as very clearly marked divisions in our results.

The city wall of Canaanite times (M.B., L.B. and E.I. 1) was laid bare in an arc bounding the western hill sector. Its first construction (M.B.) was probably laid in the seventeenth century of master field-stones averaging a meter long laid on bed rock. That this city wall was younger than the use of the important M.B. burial cave at the southeast (T. 13)¹ seems clear, perhaps subsequent also to the use of the small burial deposit on the north (T. 17)¹ though that may be no more than surmised. In the L.B. age the same wall was used and mended with somewhat smaller stones. A shortening of the circuit took place in E.I. 1 when the wall was a little lighter in structure. Very little of the brick work which may have topped out this defensive wall has remained from the successive ruinations. Of course the walls we found were stumps merely of the former works. These demolished lines seldom reached five feet in height and were about seven to eight feet in width. The Hebrew administration probably did not see a city wall, and in its day buildings were founded on and beyond the stumps. The destruction may, however, have taken place under Shishak of Egypt and perhaps in his earliest campaign, as the town is not mentioned in the campaign of 931 B.C. although places around and very near are listed. See *O.H.P.*, pp. 340-54 ff. It would not be so strange that the name of Beth Shemesh was omitted in the earlier campaign that destroyed Gezer.

While we were clearing the city-wall area on the southwest in 1928 we came on three Bronze Age cemeteries which yielded one of the largest known treasures of Canaanite burial deposits. The

¹ The references are to the plans in *Ain Shems Excavations*.

painted pottery and the characteristic shapes of the vases, scores of them whole, added to the fact that these caves and pits were in chronological succession (in the reverse order of their discovery) make the findings a valuable aid to the dating and arrangement of the antiquities found in the city, for these burials lay just outside the city wall. They are known as T. 13, T. 12, T. 11 (in *B.S.* called T. 1, T. 2, T. 3). The opening of T. 13 as mentioned was just within the line of the city wall in a room on Level IV-V at the southeast corner of our 1928 work, but the cave which we there entered ran out under the wall and beyond (see *B.S.*, pp. 60, 64, 69 ff.). It stands to reason that the builders of the wall would not, knowingly, have drawn their line across so vulnerable a hollow both within and without their defensive works. The contents of this burial cave were consistently M.B. (See *B.S.*, pp. 115-36.) But T. 12 was a somewhat different type of burial receptacle. It was a series of shallow pits connected by tunnellings beneath the rock. We labelled them A, B, C, D, E, and the T. 12 system was, further, connected by a very important tunnel with the most richly stored burial ground of all, T. 11, which had been opened at a point remotest from T. 12, the first one discovered by us. (See *B.S.*, pp. 137-60.) Now T. 12 was mixed in its contents, having both M.B. and L.B. pottery, etc. It made a chronological intermediary between T. 13 and T. 11. T. 11 was pretty consistently L.B. and transition to E.I. 1. It is not quite possible to trace more realistically the progressive use of these shafts, pits, tunnels, etc, since the shapes of the cavernous holes in the limestone, often soft marl, have changed considerably by collapse through the millennia.

Briefly we may note that the pottery of T. 13 was characterized by the carinated bowl shapes, the piriform juglet including the so-called Hyksos or Tell el Yahūdīyeh shapes, the simple form of the saucer lamp, the long sloping dipper (preceding the knife-shaved style), the drupe-jug, the combed-line-on-shoulder water jar and appropriate scarabs. (See *B.S.*, pp. 115-33 for illustrations.)

Not far away from the cover-stones which marked the entrance to the cave of T. 13 we found one of those large combed-line water

jars standing in a corner of a room IV, 9, which was an M.B. and L.B. structure. The most convincing proof of the homogeneity of the ceramic content of T. 13 was the character of the paste of the vessels. In the smaller vessels this was a creamy, homogeneous, well baked, coreless paste. The surface was usually painted a rich brown cream or red and vigorously burnished. Occasionally there was the pitted or paint decorated design on the surface. The wide open bowl-like dishes sometimes had a red cross in broad bands for arms painted within.

The older contents of T. 12 graduated nicely with the typical T. 13 specimens while the younger contents made the same easy liaison for us with the older materials of T. 11. Thus a pottery sequence as helpful as if on the classified shelves of a museum was stored in these three Canaanite cemeteries at the southern end of our 1928 operations. In the older parts of T. 12 the carinated bowls and the piriform juglets continued, also the elongated dipper styles, the wide open bowl-like dish with red painted crossed bands inside. There follows the "bilbil" type of oenochoe, the squat stable-based small jug with double strand handle, the developing saucer lamp and appropriate scarabs.

T. 11 shows the Mycenaean, highly polished (burnished), painted ware in stirrup vases, flasks, pyxoid pots and tiny piriform vases, straight jugs developed somewhat after the analogy of the "bilbil," wishbone-handled bowls (ringbase ware), freak flasks, spouted pitchers, sometimes with bails, continuing development of the pyxoid pots, elongated and made in local clays with painted patterns, in checkerboard, lattice, ladder-and-banded, knife-shaped dipper, ring flask, wide-mouthed jars, pinched pouring lips and appropriate scarabs.

This line of ceramic development, so gradual and so related in its parts, was reinforced by the findings within the streets, houses and shops of the city, outside of which these burials lay.

The preliminary maps of old *B.S.* are begun in *A.S.*, Part I, folding maps (a) and (b). They show that once within the circumvallum we come upon two splendid houses; the older (found 1928) abuts on the city wall, a somewhat younger and better preserved (found 1930) may have been an official building at the height of E.I. 1. Beneath its powerfully built walls were the

outlines of several previous stages in the occupancy of the site contemporary with the house just mentioned as found in 1928. From the north boundaries of these two, started (in E.I. times) a wide street, that is, wide for these towns of southern Canaan, that paralleled the city walls at about eighteen meters distance. This certainly looked like town planning about 1300 B.C., more probably that than a ruthless cutting like a swath as was done recently in Beirūt, Syria. Bad treatment was accorded the Bronze Age structures which stood in the way of this E.I. 1 reformation. The M.B. and L.B. had been more accommodating in their lines so that more often repair and improvement took place rather than wholesale demolition of what preceded.

Between the street and the city wall were many small houses in E.I. 1 and later shops, bins, casements on the city wall also. In the northern area were cisterns, open spaces, possibly gardens, and, looking toward the sea, a palatial house where the western breezes blew over the great defensive tower on that side.

The Temple, which had been a palimpsest for centuries, received a strong enceinte in heavy stone, the southwest corner of which jutted into the street, narrowed at that point to about three and one-half meters, whereas it had been running over five meters wide. Foundations of columns are visible within the western entrance of the Temple leading straight back to the shrinal portion. The cult objects found in these ruins are mentioned in *B.S.*, especially on p. 107. South of the Temple, between it and the street, was a triangular spot, one-time market, perhaps one-time sacred spot, although the writer is now disposed to consider the round flat stone and meter-wide circular shaft in the bed rock evidence of an aborted cistern rather than a sure-enough sacrificial stone. Perhaps the stone was for slaughter and afterward intended as a dripstone for a cistern shaft that never got beyond ten feet in depth and was then given up.

East of the Temple, thanks to our 1930 excavations, was found an industrial property, of the sacred place probably, to wit, a great pottery kiln. Immediately northeast of the Temple and nearer was a place for making or selling small objects, votive, etc. Here a cistern (17) was hewn. Though filled with mud when we saw it, we rescued a number of small objects of considerable

interest. (*A.S.*, Pl. XXI, above.) At the north, in the extreme end of the 1930 trench, were fine structures. These excavations completed in 1931 revealed a choice collection of M.B. pottery in a burial pit; scarabs and a valuable diorite bowl belonging to some M.B. admirer of the art of ancient Egypt, for the bowl was probably one thousand years old when in possession of its early Beth Shemesh owner.

Whatever be the decision concerning the rugged circular slab and its ten-foot, yard-wide shaft in the nearby bed rock, there can be little question as to the baetyl and socket found not far away and now reposing in the yard of the Palestine Museum at Jerusalem. This sacred stone, chipped from very hard limestone, tapers at both ends and is illustrated on p. 45 of *Beth Shemesh*. The slab mentioned above was carefully covered and remains undisturbed on the spot where we found it.

We found a good supply of tools and handles and very many weapons. Jewelry must have been very plentiful. Much of it would be remelted when of gold or silver. Some of it was made of bronze encased in gold. The gold hangs in shreds when the bronze swells under corrosive influences.

A very interesting discovery links the history of this site with that of Tell Beit Mirsim. It is the seal impression of Eliakim, steward of Jehoiachin, on a jar handle. Dr. W. F. Albright found a similar impression on a jar handle two years before ours turned up and another in 1930. (See his voluminous treatment in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LI, Part II, June 1932, pp. 77 ff.; see also *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, Revell, 1932, p. 125.) We found many jar handles with the royal ascription and pertaining to Hebron, all of which seems to link Beth Shemesh very closely with the ancient capital and its associated towns.

The life at the western end of the hill, perhaps the most favored part of the city in the centuries from 1600 to 600 B.C., certainly, is now fairly open to view. Salubrious quarters have been spotted in the large buildings exhumed through three Haverford seasons. Shops and smaller dwellings clustered in the southwest sector along the wall-line and in the southwest suburbs in Iron Age times. The Temple occidented to the sea saw the confluence of the

two fertilizing valleys and must have been devoted to a more or less sublimated nature worship, at least down to the Exile.

Hebron was the dominating large center for most of these centuries rather than Jerusalem, though of course the latter became the orthodox capital in the last century of the town's existence, witness the seals. Egypt was far and away the great power in the consciousness of most of the millennium envisaged. North Syrian influences are seen but faintly, Aegean more prominently. Babylonian and Assyrian may yet be found to have had more control than we have yet been able to show. For purposes of defense the water supply is much more impressive than the wall system. But the greatest defense was tribute and the placating skill which the town was always ready to use. Thus the attack on this side of the mountains was ever more commercial and amenable to reason than where the fiercer tribes of the east made their raids.

The people, or some of them, had an unusual predilection for beauty, color, line, foreign artistic achievement. The clays did little to help the imitator and the preoccupations of the place, presumably business, diverted much of the artistic taste which could be well expended on importations. The imports in objets d'art as well as in utilities included alabaster, bronzes, gems, jewelry, scarabs, seals, and weapons.

The religious ideas were catholic and mature and the symbols are numerous, carrying us to analogies Egyptian, Mycenaean, Minoan, as well as Palestinian. So far there is no evidence of the fiercer aspects of this devotion to the principles of fertility, but much suggestion of the eclectic and the humane. Wine, oil, grain, barter, dignity, officialdom, travel, news, compromise, are the notes we hear.

Our 1931 excavations came for the first time into close association with Mackenzie's locations and, since he had cleared the monastery which we were not free to fill or remove, we kept outside its limits on north and west and came upon a complex of late buildings appertaining to the settlement of monks and later Arabs. A powerful wall running east and west along the north side of the ecclesiastical settlement showed a breach at the end nearer the mosque and road, and everywhere the monastic buildings were covered with cheaper walls which turned the large

rooms into small ones, blocked the old northern portal, and accommodated people of the land who may have held on at this traditional spot up to the time of the Crusades.

Beneath these post-Christian era structures, a thousand years older, we found a fine example of an Israelite olive-oil establishment, two stone vats and four handsome imbedded jars, in two of which were quantities of carbonized olive pits. Earlier still by six hundred years we came on the relics of a fine Early Iron I occupation.

L.B. and M.B. were not as impressive beneath this town as they were on the western end of the hill, but showed a few unusually well made vessels, thus revealing qualitatively if not in quantity the temperamental harmony of the populace in the second millennium B.C. between the north, middle, and western wards.

With the keenly appreciative work of Mackenzie at the east and in the south-middle of the town and our own endeavors yet to be thoroughly expressed in reports, we are left with prospects still remaining at the top of the hill (acropolis) and three-quarters of the northern parts of the hill to be cleared. Perhaps still more important burial grounds remain hidden and, we hope, clearer traces of Early Bronze and the beginnings of Middle Bronze Canaanite civilization at this site. The position occupied by Beth Shemesh had certain advantages for the inner and outer communications of the Shephelah, mountains and plain. It may have been occupied continuously for nearly a millennium and a half.

OBJECTS DRAWN TO SCALE




FIG. 1. *Stirrup vase* (n.s. No. 108), found April 21, 1931, outside and east of Room 17, Level IV, Late Bronze. Another view is in *A.S.*, Plate xvi, lower left. The ware is light brown, not particularly fine, the decoration, striping and banding, in red and brown paint. 138 mm. tall, disc base. The offset spout is taller than the central post that joins the stirrup-like handles and is seen rising beyond the central post in this view.




FIG. 2. *A bowl* (n.s. No. 92), light brown ware, slip smoothed, decorated with red paint outside and inside; disc base slightly concave. Found April 21, 1931, beneath former III, 13, on Level IV, diameter 255 mm.




FIG. 3. *Goblet* (n.s. No. 67), reddish brown ware, dark grey core, slip smoothed, decorated red paint, four panels, provenance same as No. 92; 190 mm. tall.




FIG. 4. *Cypricote bowl* (n.s. No. 156), wishbone handle, grey ware, dark grey core, fine grits, slip smoothed, decorated with brown paint, diameter 180 mm., found April 28, 1931, Room IV, 22.




FIG. 5. *Flask* (n.s. No. 58), actual size, buff ware, small grey grits, wet smoothed, decorated with red paint, height 131 mm., found April 21, 1931. III, 12.




FIG. 6. *Saucer lamp* (n.s. No. 65), from IV beneath III, 13, rounded bottom, reddish brown ware, many medium white and grey grits, wet smoothed, 168 mm. long.

FIG. 7. *Saucer lamp* (n.s. No. 66), similar, light red ware, wet smoothed, 122 mm. long.

YERVANT H. HADIDIAN

*Secretary of the Armenan Missionary Association
of America, New York, New York*

PHILONISM IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

PHILONISM IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

By YERVANT H. HADIDIAN

ONE group of scholars have betrayed a manifest eagerness to dissociate the teaching of the Fourth Gospel from the influence of the Judeo-Alexandrian philosophy, the assumption being that a connection between the two is in the nature of cutting down the supreme estimate given in the Gospel to the personality of Jesus. That a right approach to the subject would leave no room for such an assumption will be evident from what follows.

Judeo-Alexandrianism as represented by Philo has several striking features that should not be overlooked or underestimated.

First, there is the significant fact of Philo's influence upon Christian theology. Philo has been associated with and revered by Christians in general and Christian writers in particular to such an extent as no other non-Christian or Jewish writer outside of the Old Testament. Jerome includes him in the list of Church Fathers. According to a tradition related by Eusebius, he met Peter in Rome and became a Christian. From Justin Martyr on, the influence of his views is clearly noticeable. And the works of the Alexandrian School, i.e. Pantaenus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen,¹ bear the unquestionable marks of Philo's speculative conceptions and mode of interpretation (allegorical method). A remarkable evidence of the place Philo held in the eyes of the Christians can be found in the fact that his works have been among the first ones to be translated into other languages and to be classed with the works of the highly esteemed Christian writers of the first centuries. Immediately after Armenia's acceptance of Christianity, Philo's works were translated into Armenian.² This indicates that among Christians Philo's influence

¹ See article on "Alexandrian Theology" by W. R. Inge in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.

² The Armenian version of *On the Contemplative Life* is considered by F. Conybeare "to represent an earlier stage than any existing Greek source,

was universal and to his writings paramount significance was attached. How to account for this influence? The tradition of Philo's having become a Christian may be without any historical foundation. But there is this manifest tendency on the part of early Christians to "Christianize" Philo and his writings, a feature which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for except on the theory that his conceptions were detected in the writings of the New Testament, and were, therefore, understood to bear the stamp of Apostolic endorsement. The earliest traces of attempts to draw upon the Alexandrian theology (in whatever sense that may be) should be sought in the New Testament.

Second, Judeo-Alexandrianism is primarily a Jewish philosophy. It is Hebraic first, Hellenic afterwards. It is the product of a devoutly Jewish mind. Its source is the Old Testament; its zeal is for the Old Testament, and it interprets the Old Testament. But it is an interpretation designed for the Hellenic mind, after the patterns of the Hellenic thought. Hence its connection with Stoicism and Platonism. It is not a fusion of Judaism, Hellenism, and Orientalism, in the sense that this has been devised with the idea of creating a philosophy acceptable to all the adherents of these three streams of thought. The eclecticism of Philo's philosophy is beyond question. But it is a Judaism modified by the other two factors. It is a Judaism that has drawn upon and been shaped by Hellenic and oriental thought, in order that it may be intelligible, appealing, acceptable to the pagan world of that time. It is presented with a Jew's zeal for the religion of Jehovah as the only true religion. "Philo's chief aim in all his works . . . is to demonstrate the universal validity of Jewish religion as enshrined in the Old Testament, and *par excellence* in the Pentateuch."³ To be sure, Greek philosophy had an irresistible fascination for his mind and he called Plato "the sweetest of all writers" (Guthrie). On the other hand, the Hebrew Scripture was the unchangeable, eternal norm of truth. But as it stood, i.e. taken literally, it was irreconcilable with Greek philosophy. This difficulty he overcame by resorting to allegorical exegesis, which he not excepting even the extracts in Eusebius." *Philo about the Contemplative Life*, p. 21.

³ H. Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Religion*, p. 31.

calls "The favorite method of men of vision."⁴ In the application of this method he at times goes to grotesque and ridiculous extremes. Philo's sincerity and profound spirituality reflected in his writings cannot be questioned. The poetic beauty which marks his style, when he gives expression to the feelings of his soul, excels that of the Psalms, and is an outpouring of a devoutly religious mind. "Bounteous, O Lover of giving, are thy kindnesses without limit, or boundary, or end, as fountains which pour forth streams too plentiful to be carried away."⁵ "O Mighty Lord, how shall we praise thee, with what lips, with what tongue, with what speech, with what governing power of the spirit? Can the stars, blended in single chorus, chant thee a worthy anthem? Can the whole heaven, melted into sound, declare even a portion of thine excellence?"⁶

The significance of this second point lies in the fact that the Judeo-Alexandrian philosophy was not repulsive to Christians. Its exponent was Philo, a Christian-like, educated Jew. It was based on the Old Testament, equally authoritative with Christians as with Jews; therefore, it contained much that appealed to them. Are we not justified in assuming that the writer of the Fourth Gospel also, as well as the later Christian writers, may have been, directly or indirectly, attracted to it?

Third, the discovery of an Old Testament or Hebraic origin for the prologue of the Fourth Gospel does not affect the issue. Could it be claimed that the cosmic value attached in the prologue to Jesus' person would gain in historicity or assume factuality should the term "Logos" with its functions be proven to have been derived from the *dābhār* (דבר) of the Old Testament or the *memra* of the Targums; and would it remain an abstract or mere honorary feature if the Alexandrians or Greek philosophy proved to be its source? It could, if the fundamentalist view of the Scripture were true, which, translated into plain terms, is an assertion that the Jewish mind alone was capable of conceiving the

⁴ De Plant, Cohn's edition, p. 32.

⁵ Philo, *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*, 31, ed. Cohn and Wendland, Berlin, 1896, as quoted in H. A. A. Kennedy, *Philo's Contribution to Religion*, p. 17.

⁶ Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, Lib. II (III), 239, ed. Cohn and Wendland.

whole truth and only the truth. Such aberrations of human reasoning we do not propose to share.

Further, Jesus would not necessarily be all that the Christians or even the Apostles have found him to be in terms of the Old Testament thought. He was not, for example, the kind of Messiah that the Apostles saw forecast in the Jewish Scriptures and the apocalyptic literature. This is not to controvert the adequacy of the Logos conception as applied to Jesus. The point here raised is that the Old Testament basis for that conception does not lend any additional weight to its validity as descriptive of the nature and identity of Jesus' person and divine functions, except insofar as it was held and its meaning was explained by Jesus himself.

The importance of this third point lies in the inevitable conclusion to which it leads, namely, that we should not be alarmed if an Alexandrian contact be established with the Johannine Christology or, for that matter, with any phase of the New Testament theology.

Moreover, why be alarmed at all? The Old Testament is, after all, the principal source of Philo's philosophy.

Fourth, a basic difference between two conceptions of similar vein does not prove that one has not borrowed from, or depended upon, or been acquainted with, the other. To show that John's Logos is fundamentally different from Philo's Logos, is not to disprove that John⁷ had no contact with Philo's conceptions. Could not John have taken the impersonal, pneumatic, abstract Logos of Philo and have made it personal, real, concrete in the historically revealed person of Jesus?

Fifth, Philo was a contemporary of Jesus and Paul, and by the time that the Fourth Gospel is supposed to have been written, Philo's conceptions had had ample time to spread, and even to penetrate into Palestine. Philo himself visited Jerusalem "to offer up prayers and sacrifices in the temple." And the soil was prepared for the rapid spread of his philosophy in Ephesus and Asia Minor where Heraclitus, the Stoics, Plato, and oriental religions had already for centuries sown their seeds. The eclectic

⁷ In this article the name John is used only for convenience—to designate the author of the Gospel, whoever he may be, the Apostle John or someone else.

character of his philosophy made it adaptable to all types of mind, and in each component of thought that constituted his eclecticism there was much which a Christian thinker would be attracted to, would appreciate, and adopt.

Finally, supporting this claim that the prologue is based on an Hebraic source, there is this theory maintained by Rendel Harris, according to which "the Logos of the Fourth Gospel is a substitute for a previously existing Sophia." The prologue, he holds, is dependent upon the eighth chapter of Proverbs⁸ and its pendant, the ninth chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon. Dr. Harris tries to prove his hypothesis by comparing the language of the prologue with that of the Wisdom Literature and then by tracing the identification of Jesus with Wisdom in a hypothetical "Book of Testimonies" (supposed to be existent but lost), and in the writings of Justin, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenaeus, Tertullian, etc. He contends that the order of evolution of the Christology is that Christ was equated first with Sophia, and then with Logos. Logos and Sophia "were originally very near together, almost a pair," so that the latter gradually was replaced by the former.

There exists a close affinity between the contents of the prologue and the eighth chapter of Proverbs, and its pendants, and some such theory as advanced by Rendel Harris, is reasonable and deserves consideration. In criticism of the theory, however, several points can be raised.

In the first place, the personification of Wisdom in the Wisdom Literature is purely poetical; consequently, outside of that literature, neither in Jewish theology nor in interpretations of cosmic processes has it been made use of or accorded a place.

Again, Dr. Harris himself, in tracing the usage of Wisdom of God as applied to Jesus in post-Johannine writings and finding in them the frequent collocation of Logos and Sophia, is contradicting his own hypothesis that Sophia evolved into Logos, or constitutes the first step in the order of transmission. In a writing like the Fourth Gospel, which was produced, in all probability, long before the works of Justin Martyr and, undoubtedly, before

⁸ See for a similar view D. B. Macdonald, "Begotten not Made," *Moslem World*, January 1916, p. 26.

those of Theophilus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, etc., there is no mention of Sophia as a predicate of Jesus, or in any form whatever. Logos appears as a clear designation of Jesus, without any association with Sophia, as in the later writings. If there has ever been a transition, it must have been from Logos to Sophia, and not vice versa. It may be due to John's usage of Logos with functions that are applied to Sophia in Proverbs that Christian writers came to use Sophia also in equation with Jesus. The only probable objection to this view is the passage, 1 Cor. 1: 24, where Paul calls Jesus the power and wisdom of God. "We preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block, and unto Gentiles foolishness, but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God." But the context in which the passage is found leaves no ambiguity as to the meaning of the expression as applied to Christ. It was the revelation and particularly the crucifixion of Christ which Paul was preaching and which seemed *foolishness* to Gentiles, that he calls the wisdom and power of God. The emphasis is on Christ as *crucified*. He is called the Wisdom of God, not any more than he is called the "power of God," or "righteousness," "sanctification," and "redemption," which are ascribed to him in the same context. (See verse 30 of the same chapter.) It is quite clear that Paul's Sophia has no connection whatever with the personified Sophia of the Wisdom Literature.

Further, Philo himself, who no doubt had from the Old Testament the idea of the metaphysical nature of Sophia, kept it separate from and did not confuse it with Logos.

Finally, there seems to be no reason why the author of the prologue should not use Sophia instead of Logos, if the prologue is dependent upon, or constructed out of, the material in Proverbs and its pendants. Was Sophia a repulsive or a less attractive term for the mind of his readers? On the contrary, Greeks and Jews alike were well familiar with it. Jews, through Solomon and the guild of the wise men, Greeks, through Plato and Aristotle, had come to regard it among the highest virtues.

If Dr. Harris' theory is to be accepted, we must have in our hands more data in regard to the writer's motives for absolutely discarding the term Sophia and employing Logos in its place.

The community between Judeo-Hellenism and the New Testament does not center only around the Logos category. Many common words, expressions, and thoughts have been pointed out by scholars. If this is explained not on the theory of direct dependence or borrowing, but on the theory that both have been bred in the same soil or atmosphere and the same influences reacted upon them independently, the fact remains, none the less, that the New Testament writers had contact with the non-Christian culture and thought.

Aside from the general affinities between the New Testament and Philonism, about thirty predicates of Logos can be enumerated that are common with those attributed to Jesus in the New Testament.⁹ It has already been intimated and requires no necessary evidence that the Logos of Philo is of no less a Jewish than a Stoic descent. Philo himself would not have employed the term so emphatically, and clothed it with personal and supernatural characteristics, had he not found it to be equally familiar and appealing to the mind of the Jew and the Pagan alike, and had those characteristics not existed, in germ at least, in both Old Testament and pagan speculative literatures.

The subject in question has, therefore, two self-evident features. First, that Philo is interpreting the Old Testament, and second, the close affinity of ideas between Philo and our writer (and for that matter some other writers of the New Testament), particularly in the description of the Logos.¹⁰ When we compare the attributes of Philo's Logos with those of John's Logos as cited above, the substantial similarity of both will be found to call for no further argument. The main point in com-

⁹ Jowett, *Epistle to Galatians*, p. 489, mentions seventeen common predicates which can be filled to thirty. See also Guthrie, *Message of Philo*. These are, irrespective of the degree of resemblance: Ἐλεγχος, convincer of sin (like the νόμος in St. Paul's Epistles); the heavenly man, who is opposed to the earthly; face of God; likeness; member of Trinity; propitiation; ransom; servant; ambassador; captain; appointed; the instrument of creation; prefigured by the manna; the living stream; the sword; the image of God; the high priest; the cloud at the Red Sea; the first-begotten Son of God; begotten before the world, which is God's second Son; the man of God; a second God; the paraclete and intercessor; the mediator; Melchizedek; Lord; bread from heaven; Prophet; Shepherd; teacher; omniscient.

¹⁰ Thirteen designations in common.

mon, of course, is the cosmic function attributed to the Logos. He is the Creator. The other functions, or characteristics, are the corollaries of the creative power vested in him. One who is the instrument of creation would be little short of God, and his designation as divine (in the absolute sense), the only begotten Son, a second God, or God, would inevitably follow.

The main difference between the two conceptions of Logos that has been pointed out is that John's Logos is an historical person, whereas Philo's Logos is not. And this is, it is to be admitted, the fundamental difference. Nevertheless, this difference must not be pressed so far as to signify that the idea of incarnation was altogether alien to Philo. Réville protests against the assertion that "the incarnation of the Logos was an idea wholly inconsistent with the Philonian doctrine, because of the contact with matter which it involved."¹¹ He argues that to the Logos is attributed functions which at times suggest that he regarded him as a person. Besides, Philo's conception of God as immune from any contact with matter precludes the explanation of the Old Testament theophanies as self-manifestations of God himself. Also, the conception of incarnation and personality is intimated in that of the soul's being considered as a part of and in contact with the universal Logos.

But, the weight of the difference still remains, in that John makes of his Logos a supreme incarnation of God and a person in the fullest sense of the word, and one that entered into human experience, to dwell with men and to be one of them.

To recapitulate and to conclude:

First, whatever traces of Alexandrian philosophy can be detected in this Gospel cannot be accounted for on the basis of an unmingled Jewish thinking and literature. Some degree of contact must be granted either with Philo's thought itself, or with the various constituent ideas out of which it was formed.

Second, this contact should not be interpreted as a vital acquaintance and much less as a dependence. The character of the Gospel and the Epistle tends to frustrate any attempt to prove that the writer was brought up and bred in Alexandrian think-

¹¹ Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 167

ing. Only the sharp edges of that philosophy, such as God's contact with His universe and the ways in which He related Himself to it, seem to have caught his attention. Some such problem was apparently occupying the mind of the people of his own days, as it has occupied the minds of all ages, and he had the solution. Philo's views were gaining ground, as they were offering a solution that seemed to be satisfactory to the Jew and the Gentile alike. Were they not talking about a Logos who created the universe; who was representing the Absolute God in all His dealings with His material universe; who was the God that could come into contact with matter; who, in other words, was God, or second God? Well, our author says, who is this Logos but Jesus himself? Him have we seen, handled, known. This Word who was with God, through whom the world and all things were made, became flesh and lived among us. He is not a diffused spirit or energy with an indistinct personality, but was known to us for some time as an historical person, and made known to us God his Father and the Father of all men.

Thirdly, Alexandrian speculation is made use of as a means to an end. Some of the attributes or functions which John ascribes to Jesus, he did not discern or conceive perhaps until after his acquaintance with the Logos-category. But by this it is not to be understood that he read into his conception of Jesus what Jesus was not. His conception of Jesus was such that it did not clash with Philo's description of the Logos. On the contrary, he came thereby to see Jesus in a clearer light. Some characteristics of the Logos he discovered in Jesus, and for him Jesus became the actual Logos, divested of all its Philonian unrealities and speculative uncertainties, retaining all functions and features of its nature that seemed to the writer satisfactory, and endued with "fulness." John had had a "truth which [he had] grasped by faith" and attempted to interpret it "in terms of an inadequate philosophy" (Scott). It is more accurate to say that John discovered in the Logos-category what he really believed to be true, than to assert with Moffatt that "one result of this Logos-category is that the human career of Jesus tends to become an episode in the eternal existence of the Logos." He had apparently found in Jesus' own words implications of his claim to preexistence. Per-

haps Garvie is not far from the truth in saying that "if Jesus has the absolute value for the moral and religious life of man, for his relation to God, which the Gospel assigns to him, the metaphysical significance as Word or Logos which the prologue assigns to him is not in contradiction to, but in consistency with that valuation."

A philosophy has been borrowed and has been made use of by the author, *as far as it could be made use of*, for the conveyance of a truth in which he profoundly believed. To the question then, as to whether John's Logos is the same as Philo's Logos, could be given the same answer as must be given to the question in regard to the identity of the Jehovah of the Old Testament with the God of the New Testament. The answer is Yes or No. They have different, even contradictory, features of character and nature. But they may be considered as representing successive steps in man's search for an adequate conception of God or absolute truth.

John borrowed Philo's Logos and shaped it after the Jesus whom he knew, and presented him to his readers as the true Logos, the creator of the world, the solution of the problem of God's relation to man and matter; the life and light of the world.

LEWIS HODOUS

*Professor, Hartford Seminary Foundation,
Hartford, Connecticut*

THE INTRODUCTION OF BUDDHISM
INTO CHINA

THE INTRODUCTION OF BUDDHISM INTO CHINA

By LEWIS HODOUS

THE objective before this paper is to trace the steps by which Buddhism entered China and was established and acclimated. We shall take as our limit the year A.D. 335, when Chinese were permitted to become monks by imperial decree. Unfortunately our sources are not continuous. In many instances we shall have to leap over chasms of silence from one point to another. But on the whole we can at least give in outline the process through which one-quarter of the human race came under the influence of this religion.

The triumphal march of Alexander the Great to India, the campaigns of the Romans, the pressure westward of the Chinese, the continuous inroads of the Hsiung-nu upon China and other countries of Asia broke up the localism of Central Asia and prepared the ground for an unprecedented international and interracial intercourse. In the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era armies were marching over the highways of Central Asia. Caravans of merchants wended their way back and forth. Embassies went from court to court. National and local boundaries were raised and the world was entering upon a new international life. Chinese, Indians, Huns, Persians, Egyptians, Romans, and Greeks came into contact with each other and unconsciously lost to some extent their national prejudices.

This political and commercial internationalism influenced the religion of Central Asia. The religions which had sprung up within national and local limitations began to be interpreted in the light of the larger experience of the world, and their implicit universalism became explicit. The Tao of Laotzu was regarded as operating in India and other countries. Buddha was enlarged to include all people of the world under his sway. The images and doctrines of the national religions became symbols of universal religion. This enlargement of the horizon was accompanied by an

eagerness to share the spiritual heritage with others, and by a receptivity for the spiritual treasures of other lands.

The campaigns of Alexander the Great were followed by the establishment of an Indian empire by Asoka, 273-242 B.C. He favored Buddhism because it promised to unite the races and peoples. He raised the Buddhist community to a state church and took the position of a Constantine in it. He gave himself to the stabilizing of the new religion and to its extension through India, into Ceylon, Kashmir, Kabul, Bactria, and other places. Another significant event for Buddhism and for Central Asia was the rise of the power of the Yüeh-Chih. This tribe was located west of the Yellow River in Kansu. About 165 B.C. they were dislodged by the Hsiung-nu and compelled to migrate westward. The greater part trekked northwestward to Ili. About 130 B.C. they came to the Jaxartes and the Oxus. Here they put an end to the Greek-Bactrian kingdom. Then they subdued Kabul and penetrated into the Punjab, and finally extended their power over the Ganges valley, the original home of Buddhism. Under Kanishka (A.D. 78-125), the greatest ruler of the Yüeh-Chih, Kashmir, Gandhara, Udyana, were made the centers of influence, and Buddhism began to spread over East Asia.

It will be necessary to take a brief survey of the conditions in China in order to fit them into the general situation of Central Asia. In the year 256 B.C. the long-established dynasty of Chou, and with it the feudal system, came to an end. Ch'in Shih Huang, the first emperor, conquered China and broke up feudalism. While he was able to conquer, he could not organize. This work was done by the Han dynasty 206 B.C.-A.D. 220. This dynasty revived the classics and established its empire upon the basis of the Confucian system. This was practically the extension of the system of the large clan to the country. At the head was an emperor who was the representative of Heaven, and all others were subordinated to him in a system of gradations. The emperor was responsible to Heaven, the ministers to the emperor, the lower officials to the higher officials. The relation which bound them was dependence upon and certain common duties to their chief. There was no interrelationship between the groups. Accordingly, when the central power was weakened by the campaigns against the

Hsiung-nu and could no longer compel obedience and loyalty, the groups being bound by no patriotism or loyalty to each other asserted their independence, and there followed a period of strife which lasted for four hundred years. With the disintegration of the state system, Confucianism as a national philosophy was discredited, and Taoism, the system of the party of reaction, became popular. The Taoists increased in number and power. Various sects sprang up, which carried on an active propaganda. Confucianism was influenced by these vagaries, and certain schools gave themselves up to the discussion of the *yin-yang* theories and the magic manipulation of the five elements. In other words, with the collapse of the Han dynasty, and in fact long before its end, the thought system of Confucianism was obscured, and Taoism with its doctrines of non-interference, local autonomy for the small groups and magic came into power. During this period of disintegration and disunion Buddhism not only found a receptive soil but active allies in the opponents of Confucianism as a national system.

The notice of the earliest entrance of Buddhism into China is found in a late Buddhist work (佛法金湯編, *Fo Fa Chin T'ang P'ien*) which states that in the thirtieth year of Ch'in Shih Huang, i.e. 217 (year 甲申) B.C., eighteen Buddhist monks came to Hsien Yang 咸陽, his capital, with their sutras. They were put into prison, but on repeating the Maha Prajna Paramita (摩訶般若波羅密多經), a great light with a brilliant cloud and a figure sixteen feet high appeared and with a staff broke up the prison. The emperor sent them away with rewards. This statement is not credible, not merely because the book in which it is found is a late Buddhist work, but because of the mention of the Maha Prajna Paramita, which at that time was unknown. The event is not mentioned in the *History* of Sze-ma Ch'ien. We have still to find evidence for the presence of Buddhism in China as early as 217 B.C. While the text does not give us any information about the date of the entrance of Buddhism, it gives hints as to the early methods of this new religion.

The next notice we find is under Han Wu Ti, who sent an ambassador, Chang Ch'ien, in 139 B.C., to the Yüeh-Chih,

Getae, who occupied what is now Turkestan. He was held prisoner by the Hsiung-nu for ten years. He completed his mission, returning to China in 126 B.C.

After the return of Chang Ch'ien, in 122 B.C., Wu Ti sent his general Ho Ch'ü Ping upon an expedition to reduce the power of the Hsiung-nu. The expedition was eminently successful. Great battles were fought, kings were captured and killed. Among the booty was a metal image sixteen feet high, which Ch'ü Ping brought to his emperor. Later Chinese commentators have interpreted this to be an image of Buddha. We have no proof of this. In fact we do know that these Hsiung-nu kings worshiped the images of their ancestors. Sze-ma Ch'ien gives no hint whatever of the presence of Buddhism in China in his history.

Another reference is found in a work by 王楙, Wang Mou, A.D. 1201, in the collection called 野客叢書, in which occurs the phrase "the priests of the western region." This is quoted from the preface attributed to Liu Hsiang, second century B.C. The difficulty with this is that Liu Hsiang was not the author of the work. The work belongs to the second or third century A.D. But it again gives us valuable information as to the way in which Buddhism established itself in China.

The next notice about the entrance of Buddhism is found in several sources. The primary source is the 魏略, Wei Liao, a work now lost. But we have preserved from it a quotation, the gist of which is that in the year 2 B.C. an envoy of China at the capital of Yüeh-Chih, Getae, was instructed in the Buddhist sutras by the prince of this land, but that the envoy did not believe the same. The records are not clear. Some favor the view that the Chinese ambassador was told about the Buddhist sutras, at the court of the Yüeh-Chih, by the crown prince. On the whole the latter interpretation seems more likely. The pride of Confucianism would no doubt prefer the former.

Thus far we have considered statements written after Buddhism was well established in China. We shall now discuss a record which embodies a contemporary decree of the emperor, preserved in the *Hou Han Shu* in the biography of Ch'u Ying, a brother of Emperor Ming Ti, who ruled A.D. 58-76. Ch'u Ying

governed a portion of what is now northern Kiang-su. In the year A.D. 65, a decree of the emperor was promulgated in which occur the words Buddha, ȡramana and upasaka.

This record is authentic, being found in the biography of one of the princes in the *Hou Han Shu*. According to it there were, in the lower Yangtze valley, Buddhist monks and acolytes. We do not know whether they were foreign, or whether some were Chinese. We do not know how they got there. The Buddhist terms as transliterated are different from those which we find in Loyang. Thus we have definite evidence that Buddhism was represented in China in A.D. 65, and was practised by a brother of the emperor, and was mentioned in an imperial decree.

The next notice is one which has been employed by many writers on Buddhism as the real introduction of Buddhism into China. It deals with the dream of Ming Ti and the introduction of Buddhism during his reign, A.D. 58-76. The usual form of the tradition is as follows: the dream of the emperor Ming Ti in which he saw a golden image, the despatch of the ambassadors to India, their return with two monks, books and images, the translation of the sutra of forty-two sections. The story seems highly improbable. The personages associated with the emperor Ming Ti belong to various historical periods. Chang Ch'ien belongs to the second century B.C. Fu Yin belongs to the time of the succeeding emperor Chang. Ts'ing Ching is probably another anachronism. The two Indians and the translation of the *Sutra of Forty-two* sections also belong to the second century. The legend grew from a bare statement of the dream and embassy to its present form.

The Han Shu states the dream and the sending of the embassy, without any embellishments, as a tradition current in his day. By the end of the second century Moutzu adds the White Horse monastery, and that images were made at the order of Ming Ti. In the fourth and fifth century the names of the Hindu monks are added, also the fact that they transported the sutras on a white horse, and that they brought the first image of Buddha, said to have been made by the King Udayana.

A further characteristic about the legend reveals it to be a ten-denz or propaganda story produced by a later age. This is the

matter of the dates. With one or two exceptions the dates given for the setting out of the embassy or its return are A.D. 64. Out of eight authorities, three place the dream in A.D. 64 and two place the return of the embassy in A.D. 64. While they seem to be quite divergent in their dating, still these two systems are based on the same theory. They are both thinking about the introduction of Buddhism into China. The one considers the dream as the introduction, and the other considers the return of the embassy as the introduction of Buddhism. Both regard the introduction of Buddhism as the important event, and hence have chosen the year 64, which is the first year of the cycle. This artificial dating is also an internal evidence of the tendenz character of the report.

The legend is highly improbable, not only on account of the evidence of internal accretion, but also for external reasons. During the reign of Ming Ti, 58-76, Central Asia was disturbed by war and an embassy of this character was quite impossible. But there is even greater evidence against the legend, and that is that a brother of Ming Ti, who ruled a state in the Yangtze valley, was practising Buddhism. Buddhism was already present in China.

While the legend does not give any information as to the time when Buddhism was introduced, it does give us interesting details as to the methods which were employed. The story is a tendenz propaganda, with the purpose of giving antiquity and authority to a system which was already well on the way of becoming established in China.

After the note in the biography of Ch'u Ying there is a long period of silence, during which we hear nothing of the new religion. This is not at all surprising, because the records were made by Confucian scholars, who were not interested in Buddhism, and who were incapable of interpreting the significance of the presence of a few strangers from Central Asia and India. There is no doubt that Buddhists were present in China during these years, and that they were quietly though very slowly extending their influence.

During the second century we find Buddhism quite firmly established in several places in China. By the end of the century there were several centers with established monasteries, having

foreign monks, native monks and laymen connected with them, and carrying on a work of translation and propagation.

One of these centers was the capital of China, Loyang. The earliest name of a Buddhist connected with this city is that of An Shih Kao, 安世高, a prince of the royal house of An-hsi, eastern Persia or Parthia or Arsak. This man gave up his kingdom to his uncle when his father died, and became a monk. He came to Loyang in 148, and labored there on translation work until 170. He undoubtedly found Buddhists there. If he had been the founder of the Buddhist community, the legend of the dream of Ming Ti could not have arisen. There was also 支婁迦讖 Chih Lou Chia Ch'an from Yüeh-Chih, who came to China in the reign of Ling Ti, and in the period 178-190 did some work of translating. About that time there was Chu Fo So 竺佛朔, who translated 般若三昧 in the second year of Kuang Ho, A.D. 180. He had two Chinese writers, Meng Fu and Chang Lien. In the same company was an upasaka from An-hsi, who was given the title of head officer of cavalry. He was a very sincere man, and considered the Dharma to be his duty. He explained the sutras in Chinese in oral discourses. He with Yen Fu T'iao issued the 法鏡經, *Ugra (datta) paripṛcchā*. Yen Fu T'iao wrote it in Chinese. Yen Fu T'iao was born in China in Ling Huai, in present Anhwei province.

There were also in Loyang at that time 支曜, Chih Yao, from the Western region, 康巨, K'ang Chü, and 康孟祥, K'ang Meng Hsiang.

There were at least two monasteries at Loyang, namely, 白馬寺, Pai Ma Ssu, and 許昌寺, Hsü Ch'ang Ssu, where the translation was carried on. In this school of translators were trained some of the great masters in the third century.

The church was strong enough to induce the emperor Huan (147-168) to worship Buddha in 166, and to build a temple to Laotzu and Buddha in the palace. The church not only won the emperor, but survived the destruction of Loyang in A.D. 189 by Tung Cho. At this time An Shih Kao left for the south. Chih Ch'ien left for Wu. Other missionaries arrived, who carried on the work of translation. In 222 Than Ko, 曇柯 arrived at

Loyang. He found the priests in China ignorant of the rules of the *Vinaya*, and so translated in 250 the Pratimoksha of the Mahasamghikas, the first book of the *Vinaya* translated into Chinese.

But Buddhism was not only present in Loyang in the second century. We have seen that it was already being practised in the Yangtze valley. During the period of Hsi-P'ing, 172-178, a brother of a certain Hsiang erected a stupa near P'eng Ch'en in the Yangtze valley. It was still standing several centuries later. At this time Buddhism was known in Tsinan in Shantung. Moreover, Moutzu, whom Pelliot places in the latter part of the second century, mentions monks in his work. During the Tsin dynasty (A.D. 265-307) there were communities of monks in all parts of China.

We have then concrete evidence that Buddhism was present in the Yangtze valley in A.D. 65. In A.D. 148 it was well established in the capital of China. By 166 it won the emperor, who built a temple in the palace for Buddhist worship. There were several monasteries with foreign monks, Chinese monks and laymen. This group sent some of its members to Wu and other parts of China. The presence of Chinese monks is not at all surprising, because the imperial edict of A.D. 335 permitting Chinese to become monks simply legalized a custom which was already long established.

Buddhism came to China from three directions. Loyang, the capital, received the messengers of Buddha from the Yüeh-Chih over the great highway of Central Asia, which was opened under Han Wu Ti. A second route was through Yünnan and Burma. It is quite probable that the Buddhism in the Yangtze valley came by this route. The use of different terms for sramana and upasaka in the decree regarding Ch'u Ying in A.D. 65 reveals a different tradition.

In the second century of our era a third route to China was opened, namely by sea. In A.D. 166 the ambassador from Marcus Aurelius Antonius came from Rome by this route. Tonking became the center of Buddhist activity in the second century. Pelliot places Moutzu into the last part of the second century A.D. While there may be certain considerations which favor this, the opposi-

tion which he manifests toward the Taoists and the Confucianists would point to a period when Buddhism had separated from Taoism and was following its own independent way. This did not take place until after the second century.

Why did Buddhism come? Buddhism was a missionary religion. Even before Asoka's time Buddhism manifested characteristics of a missionary religion. It was possessed of the passion to rescue people from desire. Asoka was a foreign missionary. It is certainly not his fault that we are not all Buddhists. The officials of all ranks were expected to combine the work of teachers with their ordinary duties. This spirit was not lost, but was reenforced during the reign of Kanishka. However we may explain this missionary zeal, it was one of the real things of this age. Asoka himself was a monk for a few years. It was quite common for high officials during his time and after his reign to become Buddhist monks.

This general statement is confirmed by a study of the lives of the men connected with the Buddhist propaganda. An Shih Kao was the crown prince who gave up his kingdom to become a monk, and was a missionary of Buddhism in China. An Hou, another translator, was given the title of officer of cavalry by the emperor of China. He was connected with the defense of the great highway through Central Asia. Another missionary was the son of a merchant. The spirit of missionary zeal had so penetrated all classes of people that the contacts with China, whether through the army, the frequent embassies, the merchants, were all used for the spread of Buddhism. Kanishka reproduced the spirit of his predecessor Asoka, and extended Buddhism into Central Asia and China.

Not only was Buddhism a missionary religion, but conditions in China were ripe for the idealistic religion which Buddhism brought. The inroads of the Hsiung-nu and the internal strife during the early centuries of our era decimated the large clans which were the backbone of the Confucian state established by the Han dynasty. With the weakening of these large clans, Confucianism lost its force, and the party of reaction connected with Taoism became the dominating force in Chinese politics. It was made up of disappointed officeholders and the small clans. Taoism spread rapidly in the latter Han and the centuries of disunion. It

formed several sects. Confucianism, already weakened in its hold upon people, developed philosophical tendencies similar to Taoism.

The Taoists received the Buddhist missionaries into their midst, and accepted the message of their religion without question. The two religions cooperated in every way. Buddhism brought a new science, a world philosophy, an elaborate ritual, a splendid art and an organization. Above all Buddhism brought a religion which at once captivated the intellectuals and brought increasing satisfaction to all people.

The two religions were most intimately connected up to the fifth century. Buddhists were called Tao jen. The preface to the *Lieh Hsien Ch'üan* states that of the one hundred seventy-four immortals seventy-four were already to be found in the Buddhist classics. The story was invented that Laotzu went to India when he left China and became Buddha. The first temple built by a Chinese emperor was built for Laotzu and Buddha in A.D. 166. The two religions were considered as one. The early Buddhists and Taoists were associated in political rebellions, such as that which finally led to the establishment of a separate state in West China under a Taoist régime. During the disturbed period of the three kingdoms, the monasteries often sheltered rebels, and many were used as places of refuge to escape forced labor and taxation. This brought the new religion into conflict with the state, and led to the ultimate separation between Taoism and Buddhism. This was fully accomplished in the sixth century.

The cooperation of the two religions during the early centuries made it possible for Buddhism to gain a strong hold in China. The fact that it has retained its influence shows the superiority of its religion to Taoism. The latter has remained through the centuries a pale copy of its rival.

According to our present knowledge of the matter, the early stages in the establishment of Buddhism are quite clear in outline. In the first century of the Christian era, Buddhism was already present. The dream of Ming Ti and the so-called embassy to India are the inventions of a later time. But though Buddhism was present, it was not very active. In the second century we find Buddhism more firmly established at the capital and also in other

centers. The foreign missionaries were engaged in the work of translation of the sutras. Even at that time there were also Chinese monks and laymen associated with them. In the middle of the century a temple was built by the emperor in the palace enclosure. At first the new religion was closely associated with Taoism and was regarded as a graft upon the same. The incursions of the Taoists into the realm of politics and social efforts discredited Taoism and led to the final separation of the two systems. This separation in the two religions prepared the way for the interpenetration of Chinese life with the spiritual vision of the Mahayana, and the creation of a new Buddhism.

ELMER E. S. JOHNSON
AUGUSTUS CHARLES THOMPSON,
STUDENT IN BERLIN, 1838-1839

AUGUSTUS CHARLES THOMPSON,
STUDENT IN BERLIN¹

1838-1839

By ELMER E. S. JOHNSON

AUGUSTUS CHARLES THOMPSON was born in Goshen, Connecticut, April 3, 1812, and died at Roxbury, Massachusetts, September 26, 1901. His father was Augustus Thompson and his mother was Keziah Hopkins, both descended from distinguished lines of New England ancestry. His scholastic training was received in the Eagle Academy at Goshen, in Amherst Academy, a two days' journey from Goshen, where his brother William Thompson was headmaster, and finally under the private instruction of his brother William at Andover Seminary. It was a long journey from Goshen to Andover at a time when the journey from Hartford to Boston occupied twenty-five hours. His parents in the meantime removed to "a tract of land almost in the shadow of Hamilton College," Clinton, New York, consequently the son Augustus C. Thompson matriculated in that

¹ Sources: The A. C. Thompson Manuscripts, including letters and journals in the custody of the Case Memorial Library, Hartford, Connecticut; The A. F. H. Schneider Manuscripts in the Schwenckfelder Historical Library, Pennsburg, Pennsylvania; (A. C. Thompson), "Neander and Strauss" in *The Christian Observatory*, Vol. II, No. 8, August 1848, pp. 370-8; *At Sunset: Recollections and Meditations*, by A. C. Thompson, with Appendix: "Addresses at the Funeral of the Rev. Augustus Charles Thompson, D.D., in the Eliot Church, Roxbury, Mass., September 30, 1901," Hartford Press, 1902; *In Memory of Prof. William Thompson, D.D.*, Hartford, 1889; *General Catalog of Hartford Theological Seminary 1927*; R. D. Hitchcock, *The Life, Writings and Character of Edward Robinson, D.D., LL.D.*, New York, 1863; *Henry Boynton Smith, His Life and Work*, edited by his wife, New York, 1881; F. Lichtenberger, *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (Hastie's translation), Edinburgh, 1889; Lexis, *Die Deutschen Universitäten*, I, Berlin, 1893; (T. A. Thacher), *Biographical and Historical Record of the Class of 1835 in Yale College*, New Haven, 1881.

institution; after a few months, however, he joined in 1831 the freshman class in Yale College, only to remain until the spring of 1832 when broken in health he retired to the home of his parents in Norwich, Connecticut, whither they had moved from New York. After months of recuperation "thoughts of study began to come back" and so he entered Bacon Academy in Colchester "for an experiment in Mathematics and Latin," and thus came into the companionship of Lyman "Trumbull, the distinguished United States Senator" and Secretary of State of Illinois. Meanwhile his father removed the family to East Windsor, Connecticut, whither he had been attracted by his former minister, the Rev. Dr. Joseph Harvey, and by the newly established Theological Institute of Connecticut at East Windsor Hill, later located in Hartford as the Hartford Theological Seminary. His health having been sufficiently restored, young Thompson in 1835 entered that institution where he spent the next three years in preparation for the Christian ministry. As the time for his graduation was drawing near he came to feel the inadequacy of his preparation to assume the exacting duties of a parish minister. There came over him a conviction that he must in some way secure further training before he began his ministry.

An opportunity to realize this came to him in the early summer of 1838 when his friend, John F. Norton (1809-1892), also a native of Goshen, Connecticut, and who had graduated from the Theological Institute in 1837, decided upon taking an ocean voyage to Europe in hopes of regaining his impaired health; Thompson was induced to accompany him. Without waiting for commencement, preparations for the departure were made. President Bennet Tyler (1783-1858), Jonathan Cogswell (1782-1864), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and his brother William Thompson (1806-1899), since 1834 Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Institute of Connecticut, June 22, 1838, provided a paper certifying "that Mr. Augustus C. Thompson has been for the last three years a member of the Theological Institute of Connecticut, during which time, his diligent application to study, and uniform Christian deportment have been such as to secure the confidence of all his instructors, and fellow students." At the same time the Hon. Royal S. Hinman, Secretary of the State of Con-

necticut, gave him a written statement setting forth that he is a native citizen of the State and "a gentleman of Character and reputation." In addition to that, Mayor Aaron Clark of the City of New York, on the 27th day of June, 1838, issued to Augustus C. Thompson a passport, describing him as "a citizen of the United States of America being at this present time of the age of Twenty-Five years, Five feet Ten inches in height, black hair, hazel eyes, dark complexion and whose name is subscribed in the body of this instrument, in his own proper handwriting," this document was viséd at the Royal Swedish and Norwegian Consulate in New York, June 27, 1838.

The two young men, Norton and Thompson, were aboard the barque *Prudent* in command of Captain Richter (alias Ritcher) awaiting to be towed around into the channel off the Battery in New York harbor—they weighed anchor at five Saturday morning, July 7, 1838, the sails were unfurled amid a rattling of the cordage and the hurrying to and fro of the sailors whose strong voices singing "Cheerily men, Cheerily men" rose above the tumult as they hoisted sheet after sheet in the wind. A calm rested on the bay so that Sandy Hook was not passed until late on the Sabbath. At nightfall that day the New Jersey Highlands faded from view and the barque with its crew and cargo and four lonely passengers bound for Stockholm headed for the sea. Within a few days after leaving port the usual ills beset Thompson. The voyage was long and tedious, storm and cold never seemed to leave them, but four ships were spoken; there was excitement one day for all on board when nine whales hove in sight. While those gathered at East Windsor Hill for commencement festivities on August 8 were quaffing their iced lemonade, Thompson and Norton were wrapped in heavy surtouts and double woollens amid an ocean scene of Greenlandish aspect. Their vessel was driven far to the north. While in that latitude, 60° 20', between Faroe and Shetland Islands, he wrote August 10 to his brother: "I have dreamed of visiting Palestine; I have wandered in imagination among the islands of Greece, and the Pyramids of Egypt; and in cinnamon groves of Ceylon, but never did the thought enter my mind, that I should drive about these cheerless regions, and shivering in August as in December." The next day he wrote: "The most

furious wind we have had any experience with yet; it blows so strong as to carry the tops of the waves off in spray. The surface of the water looks at times like drifting snow. There is a terrible agitation in the elements, and the whole scene is sublime in the highest degree. The ship creaks at every joint and threatens complete dissolution. The clouds pour out water; the skies send out a sound." And on August 12: "Being unable to sleep went on deck at midnight. The waves came nearer being mountains than I had seen before. Their white tops were singularly contrasted with the darkness of the surrounding water. The clouds were dense and black, and flying with great rapidity; but now and then they opened for a moment to let the moon look through upon the scene. 'The Lord made darkness his secret place; his pavilion round about him were dark waters, and thick clouds of the sky.' " On August 18 he added: "The storms which have overtaken us have not been of the most violent kind. The wind has blown a gale pretty regularly once a week, and the first was quite severe. . . . It was fearful, when the wind blew like a tornado, to see the men go aloft to reef the sails; some of them sitting on the extreme ends of the yards, entirely over the water; some with their hats gone and their hair streaming in the wind, and yet as composed, apparently, as if they were taking their meals in the forecabin. The waves swelled higher and higher, and every now and then broke furiously over the deck. The howling of the wind among the rigging was almost frightful. The sea too roared and the fullness thereof. The floods stood upright as an heap. Truly the voice of the Lord is upon the waters; the God of Glory thundereth; the Lord is upon many waters."

Owing to Norton's condition it was decided that they leave the *Prudent* at Copenhagen and proceed from thence directly to Berlin. At last after having passed, August 14, within a few miles of the Naze of Norway with its small red houses, Christiansand came in sight. It was a relief when the small craft sailed into the Skager Rack. While passing through that strait Thompson wrote: "Four thousand miles distance does not enter my mind when I think of home. I am there with you, thinking and feeling as ever, only you do not see me. I hope you have not felt particularly anxious in regard to me, and will not till this letter shall reach East

Windsor." After passing the northeast corner of Denmark they beheld on the morning of August 15 the Gibraltar of Sweden, Marstand Castle, and others studding the Cattagat coast. Preparations were made for lowering the sails and on August 16 the *Prudent* came to anchor in the roads of Elsinore amid a wilderness of windbound craft. The first letters home were sent back from Elsinore. The *Prudent* then ran down to Copenhagen where Thompson and Norton were entertained at dinner on August 17 by the leading American merchant of that city, George Ryan, Esq.

Thompson's passport was viséd on the 16th at Copenhagen where the castles Christiansburg and Rosenberg together with Thorwaldsen's museum were visited. After several days in that city they boarded a steamer which landed them at Stettin on August 21. Thence they proceeded by post (Schnell-Post) in a night ride over the "best of macadamized roads" to Berlin arriving on the 22nd, and registered at the Hotel zum Goldenen Adler. They were granted permission on August 25 by the Royal Police Praesidium to remain fifteen days; to remain longer in the city he was expected to have the permit renewed not later than September 7. That Mr. Thompson was registered as a resident of New York was undoubtedly suggested by his passport which had been issued by the mayor of that city; he gave his Berlin address as Spandauer Strasse No. 73, which is east of the Spree and within a few blocks of the royal palace. A medical student named Frankel, "somewhat acquainted with English," called upon Thompson at the hotel and induced him to remove to the house he was living in, Mittel Strasse 3, near the university. Here he lived in a room the walls of which were lined with pictures. He paid his landlord one dollar Prussian, by way of a pledge to secure the lodgings which could be vacated "with fourteen days notice from either party." It is of significance to note that he was given "breakfast, including coffee, sugar, milk and bread, for \$1.33 per month. Dinner at a 'Restauration' by paying in advance \$3.00 per month. Tickets are given, answering to the number of dinners paid for, one of which is returned at each meal. Can dine from twelve to three o'clock." His Puritan mind was somewhat unfavorably impressed by the sight of "tumblers of beer etc. a foot in length and cylindrical in form," and by the life in the great German capital

where "coaches and hackneys, cavalry and artillery thunder by." Within a week after their arrival in Berlin Mr. Norton departed for Paris, arriving in the French capital eight days later. Leaving a letter of introduction for Thompson's benefit at the American consulate, Norton left Paris after September 8 and sailed for home from London early in October. After a voyage of fifty-five days he finally landed at Philadelphia bringing with him part of A. C. Thompson's journal. After Mr. Norton's departure a feeling of loneliness overtook Thompson. The American Minister to the Court of Prussia, Mr. Henry Wheaton, was in Paris; the legation secretary, Mr. Fay, was in Hamburg, and the other American then residing in Berlin, Mr. Edward E. Salisbury of New Haven, was in Switzerland.

How Thompson came to choose Berlin instead of Halle is not definitely known. At the time Henry Boynton Smith (1815-1877), after graduating from Bangor Theological Seminary, and after spending the winter of 1837-1838 in Paris, was studying theology and metaphysics in Halle principally under Professor August Tholuck (1799-1877). The list of other eminent men then professors at the University in Halle included the celebrated orientalist Professor Wilhelm Gesenius (1786-1842) and the more or less liberal dogmatician Julius August Ludwig Wegschneider (1771-1849). On October 12 Thompson acknowledged the receipt of a letter of July 31 from his brother William, whom he assured that the letter "met with as warm a reception as any you ever wrote. It gave me much pleasure to find in your first sentence, your approbation of the proposed exchange of Berlin for Halle. Everything hitherto confirms the expediency of this step—or rather I might say stop." This suggests that before sailing it had been agreed he should go on to Halle. Thompson, however, for unrevealed reasons chose to be a solitary American at the University of Berlin. Among men of note then at that university was the eminent church historian Johann August Neander (1789-1850) who came to his chair when "an unhistorical age was giving way to a new spirit of investigation and consequently a new understanding of history." There also was Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (1802-1869), the head of modern orthodoxy, able and powerful, a superior teacher of the Old Testament "upholding the absolute infallibility of

Holy Scripture and literal inspiration, he ably and passionately defended the writings of the Bible against the attacks of criticism, as well as the Christology of the prophets and the historical institutions and facts of the Old Covenant." Professor August Dettlew Christian Twesten (1789-1876), successor of Schleiermacher, "made himself remarkable by his talent for clear exposition in Dogmatic theology" representing Christianity as rising from the sphere of internal experience. In the field of speculative as well as historical theology was Philipp Conrad Marheinecke (1780-1847), a professor at Berlin since 1811, who called rationalism nothing more than "obscurantism," which being interpreted he defined as "a mode of thinking without consistency, and one which never budes from its place." One must not fail to mention the cultured Friedrich Karl von Savigny (1779-1861) whom Thompson described as of "Huguenot extraction, with fine features, elegant person and bearing, the most learned man in Roman Law then living." At the same time there were at the University men like the celebrated historian Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886); Professor Peter Fedherson Stuhr (1787-1851), historian and philosopher, whom Thompson characterized as "taking snuff, spitting, laughing at his own witticisms, though one one else does"; Professor Karl Ritter (1779-1859), celebrated geographer, whom he described as "tall, commanding, venerable"; and Julius Hinrich Petermann (1801-1876), professor of oriental literature with his "four auditors." Furthermore, among the eleven preachers in Berlin, two were very famous: Wilhelm Hossbach (1784-1846), preacher at the Jerusalem and New Church, and Franz Thering (1780-1846), court preacher and university professor; the latter was as powerful and fearless as a preacher as he was large in physique.

Within a few days after his arrival in the German metropolis Thompson applied for admission to the university. The rector of the University of Berlin at that time, Professor Doctor Augustus Boeckh (1785-1867), on August 25, 1838, admitted Augustus Carolus Thompson, Connecticutensis, Americanus, and ordered him to present himself between the hours of 10 and 11 a.m. for matriculation to the dean of the Faculty of Theology, Professor and Ober Konsistorialrath Marheinecke, living in the Tauben

Strasse 3. However, in the absence of Marheinecke from the city his representative, Dr. Strauss, matriculated Thompson August 28, 1838, as a student under the Faculty of Theology. Strauss did not attempt to speak English much on account of the difficulty involved in pronunciation, so that the matriculation had to be accomplished through an interpreter. Strauss at the beginning of the interview addressed Thompson in Latin: "*sermone latina uteris?*" But the pronunciation was such the meaning of the question did not occur to Thompson until he "was well on the way back to the Mittel Strasse." A month later, September 29, he was granted permit No. 6428 to use the Royal Library. At the time of his arrival in Berlin the long vacation had just begun. There were very few people who spoke English then in the city and Thompson's own knowledge of the German was "not yet sufficient to understand or communicate much upon religious subjects." When writing to his brother William Thompson, October 12, 1838, he speaks of his trials and longings to be in a prayer meeting to listen again to "one of Mr. Nettleton's narratives—what a feast it would be!" Because of his limited practical knowledge of the German language Thompson had been permitted to register as a university student without requiring him to sign for lectures, although both Neander and Hengstenberg gave him permission to attend their lectures *auditoria gratis*. By this process they hoped he would be able by May 1839 to hear lectures with profit and should then begin to make his payments for the same.

Those more or less familiar with the hereditary background of Thompson may readily understand how he chose to remain in the atmosphere of ecclesiastical thought then prevailing in Berlin; his brother Professor William Thompson at East Windsor Hill in a letter of October 29, 1838, again heartily approving of his having remained "at Berlin rather than go to Halle," at the same time felt constrained to add the admonition: "While making yourself acquainted with the customs, characters and curiosities around you, be careful to devote a portion of time every day to study. You will have a good opportunity this winter to pursue the exegetical study of the Bible, and few branches present higher claims upon a young candidate for the ministry." That the venture was more or less anxiously regarded at East Windsor Hill

may be observed in William Thompson's additional admonition to his younger brother: "Cultivate by all means the acquaintance of some pious persons in the university or city, if they are to be found. Take care that the lax views and practices respecting the Sabbath that prevail in Europe do not draw you into a less strict observance of the day than is common in New England."

The first test came when Neander sent "*Herrn Thompson aus Amerika, Mittelstrasse n. 3*" the following autograph note: "Dear Sir. It will give me great pleasure, if you will favour us with your company for dinner next Sunday 14 October at two o'clock." In the account of this dinner party Thompson sent his parents he wrote: "And what day of the week do you think it was? Why, it was the Sabbath. I was not pleased when the invitation came to find myself bidden to a dinner on the Lord's Day; but I took it for granted that the conversation would not be of a character calculated to lead one into temptation." The meal itself, he said, "was of the first order . . . some six or eight courses, all excellent." The party consisted of twelve or fourteen, among them Professor Twesten whom he described as being an excellent man and apparently on very familiar terms with Neander. The latter's unmarried sister who was his housekeeper, a married sister, Madame Schultz, living in another apartment of the same house, and her daughter were also present. Thompson described the company as "quite cheerful, the ladies quite lively—lively—so far as is compatible with German phlegm." Two days later, October 16, he was to experience a second shock when he was a dinner guest in the home of Neander's sister, Frau Schultz, where the conversation drifted to "nothing nearer religion than Byron's works although the music was fine." Here he was initiated to something entirely foreign to anything he had hitherto experienced: "When tea was served, one of the prettiest little mouths in the world asked, 'will you take rum or cream in your tea?' Rum in tea! Rum or milk! Pestilence or purity, thought I. With as much composure as possible, I signified my preference for cream. . . . Many people, many customs, a proverb which served me very timely on this occasion." His experiences at that party led him to write to his brother William: "Perhaps you will deem it best for me to take a course of lessons on the theory and practice of danc-

exceedingly plain, but well cooked. The breakfast I have come to admire particularly; it is simply three small cups of coffee (not strong) with three small biscuits—no butter—indeed nothing farther.”

For Thompson the Christmas and New Year holiday season gave opportunity to fellowship with Dr. Robinson and with Henry Boynton Smith, the latter had come from Halle for a fortnight's visit, and we are indebted to his pen for an account of New Year's Day dinner party at Neander's house: “At two o'clock to Neander's, where was quite a company already assembled: Dr. Robinson and his wife, Mr. Thompson, Mr. and Mrs. Salisbury, Prof. Twesten, author of a famous dogmatical work, and several of Neander's relatives, most of whom spoke English. Neander, in his long boots and his buttoned-up frock coat, and his sister, who keeps house for him, unmarried both, received us with a great deal of politeness. The dinner lasted four hours, and then I went home in a rain-storm, to finish the evening in reading and writing.”

Before his return to Halle on January 11, 1839, Smith with Thompson and another American visited the castle in Charlottenburg and the mausoleum of the beautiful Queen Louise. For Thompson it permanently remained a memorable day; as he looked in through the open door he beheld the sarcophagus surmounted by “the statue of the queen,” as he wrote, “in a reclining posture as she lay upon her death bed. It is from the purest white marble, faithfully and delicately chiselled. It is the first work of art of this description which ever deeply impressed me. So beautiful, so commanding does the figure lie there in repose, you instinctively tread lighter and breathe softer as you approach. As

You mark the mild, angelic air,
The rapture of repose that's there

you fancy the spirit has only just fled, and that perhaps the breast will heave again in a moment or two.” So overpowering was the impression that nearly twenty years later Thompson in writing to his sister about that monument confessed: “It is the only work of statuary that ever deeply moved my feelings. I can see it now with perfect distinctness, as I stood there in silence, holding my

breath, thinking the bosom would heave with at least one more respiration. . . . It is a portrait-statue recumbent, said to be a perfect resemblance, not as in death, but when she lived to bless and be blessed. Nothing can be more calm and kind than the expression of her features." He quoted Mrs. Hemans' lines:

The folded hands, the calm, pure face,
 The mantle's quiet flow,
 The gentle yet majestic grace,
 Throned on the matron brow;
 These, in that scene of tender gloom,
 With a still glory robe the tomb.

Among others who came more than once to Thompson's lodgings in Berlin "and held forth volubly about 'The Church,' 'Creeds,' 'Second Advent' etc.," and who sat near Thompson at several of Neander's lectures was Thomas Carlyle (1803-1855), not the well known philosopher of that name, but the Irvingite leader, better known as an "Apostle" of the Catholic Apostolic Church, who spent much of his time in Germany whither he "was sent" to "seal 12,000."

His first meeting with Neander was not an inspiring one. "What a disappointment," he wrote to his brother William, "as respects his person merely, I mean. Figure to yourself a little man something less than five feet in stature (I should judge) with black coarse hair, short-sighted, eyes dark, and much of the time concealed by winking, or an entire closing of the lids, and a countenance compounded of Miss A . . . C . . .'s of Norwich and W W 's of Goshen. Clothe him in an old faded German sleeping gown; place him in a study somewhat larger than your own, and let a whirlwind surround him with books, papers, and dust, and you will have some of the outlines of Neander as I found him. His manner is extremely simple and without any pretensions to gentility. His body does not seem to have any elasticity or muscle about it—it is only a little loose flesh, with just circulation enough to sustain life. Without knowing that it was Neander I should have pronounced him a most harmless little bookworm. What the Corinthians said of the bodily presence and speech of Paul is more true of Neander than it was

of the Apostle. But he has a kind heart, and I have no doubt a sincere interest in the welfare of the Church of Christ. He inquired after American revivals; regretted dissensions. Spoke of Prof. Hodge and Dr. Sprague of Albany." In a later letter Thompson expressed the fear that the above description of Neander's "features was over-wrought," saying that "his countenance has on the whole, a pleasing expression."

From the contents of a letter he wrote to his brother William November 22, 1838, we learn that during the week before he had attended Neander's lectures for the first time; these lectures were given in what he described as likened to "a long hall furnished with seats, much like those occupied by the singers in the Seminary Chapel [East Windsor Hill], only thoroughly soiled, and hacked by the sharp-pointed ink-horns." Into this hall he elsewhere described as "something more than twice as large as the Seminary Chapel at East Windsor" and as being "in an old palace" were crowded between three and four hundred students, "some standing, some sitting," "some with hats on, and some with them off," "some too with caps setting as close to the head as mother's little Mary Mason, a part with smooth faces, and a part with the ornament of a schnautzbart (mustachios) . . . here and there one eating biscuits and butter, one or two in their shirt sleeves"; then again "many of them had oversleeves similar to those worn by the ladies sometimes when quilting." "Nearly all have portfolios" or are "furnished with writing apparatus, and most of them making pens." While he further described them as diligently taking "notes as fast as their pens can fly" it was to him "on the whole not a very theological looking assembly." Moreover he also observed whenever "the professor delivers anything which excites a particular dislike he is hissed or scraped. Scraping is also resorted to when the students wish to have anything repeated . . . seriousness is not often discovered in the public deportment of the students."

Thompson went on to say that the "first quarter of every lecture hour is allowed for the students to assemble. At the expiration of this time Neander made his appearance and the battle of 400 tongues ceased. Now don't do Neander the injustice to clothe him with a particle of Dr. Tyler's dignity but fancy him with a pretty

stout pair of long legged, cowhide boots (the pantaloons tucked in) pitching along the Katheder. . . . His articulation was fair but such wriggling," wrote Thompson, "of the body, and unmeaning motion of the hands I have never seen. . . . His eyes were scarcely visible during the three-quarters of an hour, and much of the time his nose was in the immediate neighborhood of his notes. He was equipped with an old pen which was subjected to the most painful twistings. This, I am told, is an indispensable accompaniment of his lectures. He is lost without it. The same is true of Steffens" [Heinrich Steffens, 1773-1845, a Norwegian by birth, and Professor in Philosophy] who, "however, uses a pencil instead of a quill." Neander's "lecture was an exegesis of a part of the first Epistle of John. I could understand only a part." That the professor was seldom careful about his appearance in the lecture room is indicated by the following lines from another letter:

"While he was in the lecture room one day his sister (who is quite a prudent body) appeared at the door, and made very earnest signs for him to come out. He did so, and found the good woman in quite a trepidation with a pair of pantaloons for him to put on. After he had left home she found this part of his dress behind him, and supposed of course that he must have gone to the University in his morning gown and drawers. For once, however, he was not so badly off, as might be expected. He had procured a new pair of pantaloons without the knowledge of his sister, and was better dressed than usual."

While the renowned Professor Pfeleiderer of a later day declared it to have been Neander's chief aim "everywhere to understand what was individual in history," he regarded his nature to have been emotional to a degree that "the greatest dramatic forces of history were hidden from him by the lyrical emotions of single individuals." Nevertheless Neander made a lasting impression upon Thompson who later testified that Neander showed "more cordiality than could be expected from a recluse scholar, a student of antiquity," that he was a man having "warm sympathies . . . with living men," that he "is confessedly at the head of ecclesiastical historians, whether living or dead. No one has ever united to a minute and comprehensive acquaintance with patristic learning, so much of noble philosophy

and Spiritual Christianity." Neander is said to have raised Berlin University to the position of a training school for the nineteenth century church historians, prominent among whom were Hagenbach in Basel, Herzog in Erlangen, Moeller in Kiel, Philip Schaff in the United States. Through his labors, we are told, a pious pragmatism replaced the profane subjective pragmatism of the earlier Planck. It was largely due to Neander's influence that the piety of humanity in its variety of applications became a recognized factor in the historic movements.

Thompson was also fortunate in establishing a friendly contact with Professor Hengstenberg, titled the head of the modern orthodoxy. At the same time it is claimed that as a journalist (he founded in 1827 the *Evangelical Gazette*) he is more celebrated than as a theologian. He taught the Old Testament upholding the absolute infallibility of Holy Scripture and literal inspiration. His lectures consisted of powerful replies to the "objections brought against the Pentateuch" under the subject of the History of the Kingdom of God in the Old Testament. Henry B. Smith in describing him said: "His wit is so bitter, you cannot laugh at it; there is too much truth in it. . . . Hengstenberg the iron man; everywhere spoken against and reviled, yet feared too. . . . He is striving to save the Old Testament for Germany as a book of divine authority." Thompson in a letter to his brother William described Hengstenberg by saying: "Put fifteen years and a pair of whiskers on to John Humphrey, and you have him precisely. What is quite rare here, he is a modest man, almost timid. His delivery in the lecture room is not particularly agreeable. The key of his voice is quite variable—he soars and pitches, half sings, half whines and now and then speaks naturally. A little dry wit occasionally gives spice to his matter." Thompson spoke of him as "more gentlemanly in dress and manners" than Neander and as noted for the peculiarity "that, with an elbow resting on the desk, he twirls a lock of hair that falls upon his forehead."

The acquisition of a practical knowledge of the German language was a real task for him. At the moment of his arrival in Berlin he was only able to deal through an interpreter, although he could read the language intelligently. After five months he was

"beginning to understand the language sufficiently to enjoy conversation, although as yet only in an imperfect degree." He believed by learning twenty words a day it would require eight years of time to become a "master of the German." He not infrequently lamented the slow progress he was making although he held himself to a severe program, arising at five in the morning he applied himself until ten at night, with the necessary interruptions, reading "a little Hebrew every day, endeavoring to be thorough. A little Dogmatick. Schiller for the sake of conversational language. These with two lectures, my German lesson, and the many little intellectual things, fill up the day, or rather bring morning and evening together." His first residence in Berlin happened to be in the home of a certain Dr. Frankel, one of the ten thousand Jews then in Berlin. While exploring the city during those first weeks before the professors had returned for the opening of the university he happened to enter one of the bookshops to inquire into the nature of other books published by Neander than church history, he found an intelligent young clerk who spoke a little English. As he was leaving the place he turned to the young man with the question "if he knew of anyone who would like to give and receive mutual instruction in the German and English language." The clerk replied that his roommate, a *candidatus Theologiae*, was a young man who had completed his studies in the university and that his name was Schneider. He furthermore informed Thompson that it was the intention of himself and his roommate to pay a visit to England in the next ensuing spring and were therefore quite anxious to acquire a better knowledge of the English language. The outcome of this visit was that the three young men met every evening in the week with the exception of the Sabbath evening for two hours in mutual language study. For Thompson it was a matter of very great value since it would have been impossible for him to "receive this instruction short of two dollars per week."

It is of more than passing interest to the friends of Hartford Theological Seminary to discover that the young man named Schneider was none other than Augustus F. H. Schneider (1806-1890), often spoken of as Friedrich Schneider. The young clerk in the bookstore was Julius F. Ziegler. Both young men were

natives of Silesia. Subsequently Ziegler was with the firm of Grass, Barth & Co., in Breslau. It was Schneider who then acquainted Thompson with the life and works of Caspar von Schwenckfeld (1490-1561), the Silesian reformer. In writing to his brother William he described Schneider in appearance "to be a truly good young man, in person and manners a little like Mr. Wood of the Institute. . . . He is preparing a history of the Schwenckfelders,"² which will not be published under several years. I have engaged to make investigations for him upon my return to America. They are found principally in Pennsylvania. Can you give me any information in regard to them?"

The outcome of his meeting with these two young men led Thompson to change his residence and join Schneider at Louisen Strasse 17, where they lived on the third floor sharing one room which had a dormer window. The furniture, aside from the cots, contained in one corner of the room a little stand and by the side of the window a writing table, in the opposite corner a round table along the side with a small library table, a sofa in the corner of the room, a few chairs, and a long table on which they could lay out their books and papers. On the walls were pictures and portraits. The floor of the room was bare. The window was hung with heavy curtains quite characteristic of the German home. He regarded his "hostess a woman of much respectability." Schneider then had an extensive collection of books, especially literature relating to Schwenckfeld, which was at Thompson's service. That library is now distributed largely in the erstwhile Royal Library of Berlin, the British Museum in London, the Case Memorial Library in Hartford, and the Schwenckfelder Historical Library of Pennsburg, Pennsylvania. Schneider and Thompson spent their winter evenings of 1838 and 1839 on opposite sides of a table in that upper room; Schneider taught Thompson German, while Thompson taught Schneider English. At the expiration of six weeks Schneider and Thompson conversed almost exclusively in German. While Schneider gave Thompson "a drilling on acht

² Schneider published: 1) *Zur Literatur der schwenckfeldischen Liederdichter bis Daniel Sudermann*, Berlin, 1857; 2) *Ueber den geschichtlichen Verlauf der Reformation in Liegnitz und ihren späteren Kampf gegen die kaiserliche Jesuiten—Mission in Harpersdorf*, Berlin, 1862.

tausand, acht hundert, acht und achtzig," the latter "retaliated by putting him (Schneider) through a rhyming martyrdom as follows:

Tho' thorns and thistles lie thick in the path,
Tho' fathers may threaten with withe and with lath,
And thrust us without and thrust us within,
Both hither and thither, through thick and through thin;
Tho' brothers loath truth, and lie with each breath,
Tho' thrall be the theme, thirst, throttling, and death;
Tho' thumbs thrust through with Forsyth's scythes,
The youthful thief with throes now writhes;
Thrice thirty-three thousand times worse forsooth
Is this *th* for the throat and the tooth.

When Sylvester Night came the two young men "as did many others, engaged in joint religious reading, till midnight." Raising the front windows of the house they listened to the church clocks ringing the hour of twelve and to the salutations of the people as they shouted through the streets of the city: "Vivat Neuesjahr!" This association between Thompson and Schneider is of real significance. The winter they spent together in Berlin remained for them a happy memory. Few letters were exchanged between the two in after years. There is preserved, however, a small Oxford Testament printed in 1824 which Thompson presented to Schneider on April 15, 1840. The latter almost sacredly preserved this Testament to the day of his death in 1890, and in 1912 it was returned by his niece to the writer of this paper. It is now preserved in the Schwenckfelder Historical Library at Pennsburg, Pennsylvania.

Schneider was the most thorough student of the life and works of Schwenckfeld which the nineteenth century produced before Hartranft. In 1878 when Hartranft had been called to Hartford as a professor, Thompson one day found him poring over a number of the books in the Library of the Seminary in which he recognized the autograph of Friedrich Schneider, and exclaimed to Hartranft: "Why, that is the signature of my roommate in Berlin," and forthwith proceeded to give Hartranft a lecture upon the life and significance of Caspar von Schwenckfeld. This was Hartranft's real introduction to the Silesian reformer. It was

therefore but natural for A. C. Thompson to appear before the executive committee of the Hartford Theological Seminary on the 9th of May, 1900, in the office of the late Jeremiah Allen, with Lewis Hicks, Rowland Swift, John Allen, Dr. Hartranft, and representatives of the Schwenckfelders of Pennsylvania present, and to make his plea in behalf of the Schwenckfelder publication known as the *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*. In that plea he recounted his experiences with Schneider whom he characterized as a Christian gentleman whom he could not forget. It is worthy of note that ten years earlier Schneider on his part spoke of Mr. Augustus Thompson of Windsor, Connecticut, with whom he had lived in Berlin, as one of the choicest of men whom no one would ever wish to forget; adding that such men are rare and praying that God's protection might be over him. The affection therefore between the two men was mutual. Nor would Thompson's interest in the enterprise end with that appeal on the 7th of June, 1901, he wrote to Hartranft: "It seems to me the Schwenckfelders of Pennsylvania should be kept no longer in doubt, nor in the suspense of further postponement. Can you not take Neuchatel and Godet en route? . . . I do not forget the liability of a funeral service here, at which it would be greatly desirable that you and Drs. Judson Smith and A. H. Plumb should be present. Distressed respiration continues owing to an effusion which presses upon the lungs. At my age any surgical operation would be attended by special risks."

And again on June 10: "I am troubled about the delay in the Schwenckfeld visit to Europe this season. The vote of the Trustees was without qualification. Our friends in Pennsylvania who have long and nobly had a special right to look for beginning of fulfilment the present season. The Divine plan is always broad and often embraces conditions that seem at the time inauspicious, but which are later found to be a special favor. May not the Godet detour turn out to be one of them?" And finally, on June 28, as follows: "I am glad that a communication was sent to our friends, Pennsylvania Schwenckfelders, recognizing their noble patience in waiting. . . . Satisfactory arrangements can now be made for your important visit to Europe." Thus to the end of his life

Thompson was the sustaining link of the Hartford Theological Seminary with the Schwenckfelders of Pennsylvania.

While in Berlin there were many times when his soul longed for home and loved ones. The New Year's Day letter 1839 to his parents contains enough to indicate this: "If mere feeling were consulted I need not tell you with how much pleasure I should start for Havre tomorrow." He largely overcame these feelings by writing letters home. February 25, 1839, he wrote his thirty-second letter; even so he concluded it was "carrying on a correspondence where the reciprocation is all on one side," since the arrival of letters from America was all too infrequent. Between January 14 and March 5, 1839, no letter from East Windsor had reached him, so he advised "Send your letters by the way of Havre. This is more direct and certain." Often he gave expression to his feeling in poetic lines, either in original compositions or in rhythmic translations from the German. Meanwhile the family at East Windsor Hill began to be restive about their son in Berlin, possibly on account of the economic situation created by the panic, possibly because of the difficulties which had arisen between Prussia and Belgium threatening a European war, and also because of their grave concern as to what the rise of rationalism and liberal theology might do for their lone star in Berlin. For these or other reasons they wrote him in February asking him to return home by the following summer. He received this request March 31, and while it was a disappointment to him now that he had gained a command of the German, he began to prepare for the return.

It had been his hope during the "coming six months or year to lay a thorough foundation in the study of the Bible and of some of the Church fathers." However, he knew of "no motives short of imperious duty" which could support him in opposing the "wishes and advice" of his father and family. He promptly replied on the last day of March, saying "I shall leave Berlin (if health is spared) in May." Before that time travel would be difficult; then too his roommate was to leave Berlin in May. He felt repaid for his sojourn in Berlin, becoming "tolerably familiar with the ordinary language," and "having acquired the German sufficiently to prosecute" his studies with advantage, finding a few

"pleasing and important acquaintances." With regard to "rationalism and German theology in general" he did not consider himself more exposed than he would have been in America, "and even if it were otherwise," he averred, "I should hope a sound religious education, and a course at East Windsor would not be unavailing among the preventives to pernicious influence." Nevertheless from what he had seen he was ready to admit it no longer surprised him "that American students should return richer in head than in heart. No blessing at the table, no family prayers, no private circles for mutual communion, the Sabbath in general not sanctified." The church services as conducted in Prussia did not appeal to him; on a November Sabbath he went to the cathedral to hear "affable and kind" Professor Strauss. The liturgical part of the service for him did not rise above the level of "performances" and "struck" him "quite unpleasantly." That Strauss on entering the pulpit should be obliged to "bow to the Crown Prince and other members of the royal family who sat in the gallery opposite" was "none the less offensive" to Thompson who believed that "in worshipping the King of Kings, human royalty and poverty are on the same level." The preaching was too artificial. Going to Schleiermacher's Trinity Church at seven on a winter's Sabbath morning, as the "majestic tones" of the great organ filled "not only the building but the whole region," Thompson found a "lamentable contrast within" where less than forty hearers were scattered over a space large enough to hold between three and four thousand. The lights were poor while Marheineke "delivered in the most mechanical manner imaginable a sermon which was suited to nothing except the delivery—frigid, stiff, and powerless. Opposite in the gallery sat a licentiate, who is a servile hanger-on of his, writing down the discourse by the light of a wax taper." Tholuck of Halle whom he listened to in one of the Berlin churches was equally unimpressive. Only occasionally had he seen a copy of the *New York Observer*, since American papers were seldom found there. He had rubbed elbows with the Crown Prince. He had been in the same room with His Majesty, King Frederick William III, at the anniversary of the National Bible Society. Moreover through the kindness of friends he attended musical concerts in the Hotel de Russie; nevertheless he feared he

should prove a disappointment to his sister, who before his departure remarked: "You must improve in manners," but "Prussia alas!" he exclaimed, "is not the place to study gentility."

Thus he was placed into an embarrassing position by breaking away thus after having gratuitously enjoyed the privileges of the university, especially through the courtesy of Neander and Hengstenberg, who expected him to assume payment for the lectures he would attend in the following semester. He was, however, resolved to "manage as well as may be about getting out of his majesty's dominions. If the king asks any reasons I can tell him that mother wants to see me, and that father says I was not whipped enough when I was young, besides its being the wrong time of the moon."

After a final visit to the Art Museum and a call on Professor Hengstenberg, after the passport vexations were over, he took a tearful leave from his friends in Berlin on May 13, 1839. Henry B. Smith gave him a letter of introduction to Professor Ulrici in Halle while Edward Robinson gave him advices about seeing London. The day previous to his departure the rector and Senat of the university issued an official declaration that "August Carl Thompson a native of Goshen in North Amerika" and son of "Partikulier Thompson zu East Windsor in Amerika," on the basis of a certificate from Yale University (*sic!*) had been a student of theology in Berlin University since August 25, 1838. They further declare that he had not signed for any lectures, but nothing untoward either of a disciplinary or economic character was charged against him; this honorable dismissal was signed by Mueller, von Ranke, Hengstenberg and Gabler.

The 14th of May he spent in Wittenberg where Professor Schneider of that seminary guided him about the city, and among the things he saw was the old wooden door on which Luther fastened the ninety-five theses. At Halle Professor Tholuck walked with him about the university and the Franke Orphanage. Visiting Naumburg a.S., May 15, to see the cathedral with Luther's pulpit and Tetzels indulgence bin, he was entertained at coffee by the Landrath Remisus. By the next day he had passed Weimar, Erfurt, Gotha, and visited the Wartburg near Eisen-

ach. He journeyed on visiting (May 17) the cathedral with its ten altars in Fulda, remaining in Frankfurt a. M. from May 18 to 20. Thence by way of Metz (May 23) with its cathedral, Verdun, and Meaux to Paris; in the latter city he remained until June 13, waiting for money; and greatly delayed by passport difficulties; unexpectedly detained for a day, June 14, at Boulogne he crossed to Dover June 15, thence overland to London, via Canterbury. After ten days with his friend Julius Ziegler in London, where, as he had done in Paris, he visited the important points of interest, he made the entry: "As for London, I am quite ready to leave it. It is a vast assemblage of bricks, smoke, fog and selfishness." What he had seen in Paris gave him the impression that "there is a revolutionary element among the French which will never be quiet." At the last he desired no one should suspect "that seeing the splendor of European capitals is creating a disrelish in my mind for the quietness and simplicity of New England."

He took passage on the packet ship *Montreal*, Captain Griffin, sailing June 28, 1839, from Greenwich. The late Dr. William Patton of New York, then in London, accompanied Thompson to St. Catherine Docks, where he introduced him as "a modest young ministerial licentiate" to Commander Griffin and added: "Captain, if any of your spare gives out, here's a stiff Yankee, that will bear a good deal of strain." During the first night the packet ran afoul of a brig and lay all of June 30 at Portsmouth. Like the voyage out, so the voyage home was long and tedious, the *Montreal* finally reaching New York on August 14, 1839. The voyage home was without undue excitement save for the presence in the cabin adjoining Thompson's of a "London cockney and his young wife" who quarrelled one with another; one night he heard the young husband "load his musket for the avowed purpose of shooting his wife, but she was at the table the next morning."

Although there appears to have been much in Berlin which disturbed his soul, nevertheless during the months he was permitted to spend there Thompson developed a taste for German literature and culture. The very large number of German books which he added to his library during a long activity as minister and student

is evidence of this fact. His most intimate German friends, Schneider and Ziegler, proved especially helpful in enabling him in spite of his limited knowledge of the language at the first to develop an appreciation for and to retain a permanent impression of the finer things in German life.

FLORENCE BELL LOVELL
*Assistant Professor of Religion, Vassar College,
Poughkeepsie, New York*

THE PORTRAIT OF JESUS IN THE
SAYINGS SOURCE

THE PORTRAIT OF JESUS IN THE SAYINGS SOURCE

By FLORENCE BELL LOVELL

HOW different is the *Morte d'Arthur* from Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*! It is not merely that one is fifteenth century prose and the other modern poetry. There is an essential difference in the portraiture of the principal figures. Tennyson used Malory's stories but he had other sources besides, and he had his own poetical tendencies, one of which was to idealize the king. Similarly, the impression of Jesus which comes from a reading of the Gospel of Mark is not the same as that given by the Gospel of Matthew; and still different is the impression conveyed by the Sayings Source common to Matthew and Luke. The sources of these various documents were not identical and the compiler of each had his tendency. It is our purpose in this paper to discern if possible the features of Jesus that stand out in the Sayings Source, commonly called "Q."

At present synoptic criticism generally, though not universally, agrees in assuming that such a document as Q underlies the First and Third Gospels as a common source. The difficulty lies in determining exactly what the document contained, a task which is extremely important when one is about to make deductions from the material presented. Fortunately, the disagreement among scholars as to the contents of Q are, with one or two exceptions, not far-reaching. We shall take a conservative estimate of its limits and confine our attention to those passages whose position in the document can be easily defended.

The first point to be noticed, for it lies easily on the surface, is that Jesus is shown as the Messiah who will usher in the final apocalyptic judgment of the world. In eschatological outlook Q is similar to Mark. There are at least six, and at most eight passages in Q which contain the phrase "Son of Man"; three out of the six or five out of the eight are Parousia passages—a fact which suggests that the original usage of the phrase was connected with predictions of the Parousia. In Mark it is used several times

in predictions of the death of Jesus but never in Q. Nor does Q contain those instances which suggest that the original significance of the phrase was generic, meaning simply "Man." Whatever the first connotation of Son of Man may have been, and whether Jesus used it of himself or not, it is clear that in our Greek Gospels, as in Q, it is intended as a title of Jesus. Quite apart from the question of the "Son of Man" however, a plainly eschatological interest runs right through Q. In the approaching cataclysm Jesus is to be revealed in glory.

The next item to be noticed is not positive but negative. Nowhere does Q imply that Jesus was the Son of David. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all understand him to be the expected king of Israel, of the Davidic line; but not Q. This is especially interesting in view of the essentially Jewish character of Q.

We come now to an important feature of Q's portrayal of Jesus which sharply differentiates itself from the corresponding feature in Mark, Matthew, and Luke. And lest any should question the propriety of seeing a "portrayal" in material which contains few narratives but many sayings, let us remind ourselves that we can see a man as clearly through what he says as through what he does. Mark presents Jesus as the Son of God who, though possessed of human attributes, lives on a superhuman plane, a god-like hero whose mighty works and authoritative words cause men to marvel. Matthew and Luke combine this with an additional element: He is in some sense the physical and hence the metaphysical Son of God. In Q also Jesus is the Son of God; but He reveals His sonship by His moral likeness to His Father, and His ability to reveal Him. There is no suggestion of supernatural birth to attest His divinity; it was a relation of love such as existed, for the prophets, between God and His people Israel. In Hosea ii: 1, a late passage, the Lord says to idealized Israel "Ye are the sons of the living God." The individuals within the group are sons, and Jesus fulfils this prophetic ideal.

The moral character and the revelatory function of the Son of God as presented by Q correspond closely to the character and function of the Servant of the Lord as presented in 2 Isaiah; and these bear a marked resemblance to Messianic features found elsewhere in the book of Isaiah. The Spirit of the Lord rests upon the

Messianic Branch, as upon the Servant; and the Spirit of the Lord rests upon Jesus from the time of His baptism. The Spirit which rests upon the Branch is the "spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." Endued with the Spirit the Servant brings judgment to the Gentiles, sustains with words him that is fainting and preaches good tidings to the meek. It is just this activity of preaching and teaching which Q sets foremost in the career of Jesus. In humility and poverty, without recognition of men, but strong in the consciousness of His divine mission, Jesus like the "wise servant" opens the eyes of the blind and lets His words sustain the weary.

The compiler of Q seems to have Isaiah in mind, for the only Old Testament quotation which he uses outside of the Temptation narrative is taken from Isaiah lxi: 1 which Jesus employs in describing the evidences for His Messiahship; His gracious words and works are considered sufficient to convince John the Baptist in prison. It is probable that under the figure of the Servant the Isaian poet is describing not an individual but a community; still the outline of this ideally righteous and wise man, this teacher of the Torah, is so clear-cut that it is not strange that many have considered it a picture of an individual; it would not be strange if this picture affected the Jewish-Christian conception of the Coming One.

The Christian community early found in the crucified Jesus the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy of the *Suffering* Servant. The Apostle Paul preached "Christ crucified," and the Gospel of Mark witnesses to the importance which was attached to His Passion. On the other hand, with the exception of the saying, "Whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after me cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv: 26-27) (Matt. x: 37-38) there is no reference to the death of Christ in Q. The compiler of Q was, of course, fully aware of the suffering and death of the Master, but so far as can be discovered, he attached no special soteriological significance to the Passion; it is not for him the climax toward which everything moves. His chief interest, like Isaiah's, lies not in the *sacrificial death* of the Servant but in the *wise, ministrant*

activities of His life. Like the Servant of the Lord, Jesus is the divinely endowed Teacher of true religion.

The Teacher's first public activity, according to Q, is to deliver a long discourse in which He enjoins a high morality from a religious motive, and uses proverbs and metaphors to enforce His points. After the sermon is ended Jesus heals the servant of a Roman centurion and marvels that He has found greater faith among Gentiles than within Israel. He is bringing salvation to the nations.

Immediately thereafter, Jesus receives the messengers from John the Baptist and sends them back to tell John that with their own eyes they have seen the realization of Isaiah's dream of the Messianic era. Then He declares that John is the predicted Fore-runner, and that both He and John were rejected by their countrymen, but that Wisdom is justified by her works (or by all her children). Jesus and John are associated with the divine Sophia.

The most interesting development within Judaism of which we have any record, during the last centuries before Christ, is the increased importance which is laid upon the concept of Wisdom. The Book of Proverbs gives us copious illustrations of the high place which was given to Wisdom, and the various benefits which flow therefrom. Many instances are found in other parts of the Old Testament as well, and in the Apocrypha. In certain philosophical circles Wisdom had even become personified, as the begotten of God, at His side when He created the world, making her appeal at all times and in all places to the sons of men, ready to guide and instruct. Naturally this exaltation of Wisdom makes its influence felt upon the concept of the Coming One; we perceive it in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi xviii) in the Psalms of Solomon (xvii-xviii) and in the Similitudes of Enoch. We shall take space to quote only from the description of The Elect One in Enoch (xlix):

For wisdom is poured forth like water
And glory faileth not before him forevermore.
For he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness,
And unrighteousness shall disappear as a shadow;
And have no continuance;
Because the Elect One standeth before the Lord of spirits
And his glory is forever and ever,

And his might unto all generations,
And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom
And the spirit which gives insight,
And the spirit of understanding and of might,
And the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness.

The author is evidently elaborating upon the Messianic endowment with Wisdom as it is described in Isaiah xi: 2. He clothes the transcendent Messiah with all the glories which had become associated with the heavenly Wisdom though without implying that he was Wisdom's incarnation. Also in Enoch li: 3 we read:

And the Elect One shall in those days sit on my throne,
And his mouth shall pour forth all the secrets of wisdom.

Scholars have traced the profound influence of this strange and interesting writing upon Jewish and Christian eschatology; it seems to have been widely read and much quoted. It is easy to see therefore how, in circles where the book was familiar, wisdom would have become foremost among the attributes of the Expected One. The Elect One of Enoch combines the features of Apocalypse and of Prophecy—outer glory and inner wisdom. This same combination is found in the Christian document Q. To be sure Q's apocalyptic is much more moderate than that of Enoch, and is always employed with an ethical purpose. Furthermore Q gives no abstract description of the Messiah's wisdom, as Enoch does, but rather a concrete presentation of the Wise Teacher.

Jesus' commission to his disciples as they set forth on their journey is prefixed by the saying:

Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests
But the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head.

Compare this with the homelessness of Wisdom in the Similitudes of Enoch xlii: 2:

Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children of men,
And found no dwelling place.

When His critics ask for a sign, Jesus replies that no sign shall be given them save the sign of Jonah the prophet. Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold a greater than Jonah

is here; a greater need and a greater preacher for that need. Jesus may have added, "And likewise no sign shall be given you but the sign of Solomon the wise. . . . The queen of the South came to hear the wisdom of Solomon and behold a greater than Solomon is here." Jesus is a great prophet and a great wise man. It is interesting to notice that the typical prophet and the typical wise man are both shown as ministering to outlanders, not to Hebrews.

Q follows this saying immediately with one about putting the candle on the candlestick that they which come in may see the light. The connection with Jesus preaching repentance and teaching wisdom is obvious.

With the woes on the Pharisees and Scribes Jesus couples a quotation from an unknown Wisdom writing, Luke xi:49, Matt. xxiii: 34-36. "Therefore also said the Wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles," etc. We are indebted to Luke for the notice that this is a quotation. Matthew simply attributes it to Jesus. In the same context Matthew places the apostrophe to Jerusalem which is evidently from Q and which concludes with the exquisite lament,

How often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not.

It is likely that this too is a quotation from some lost writing in which divine Wisdom bemoans her rejection by her children.

There is a certain historical sequence in Q as it stands in Matthew and Luke; but there is no "Messianic Secret." The secret which Jesus reveals is the hidden, divine wisdom. The most important Christological passage in Q contains the declaration:

All things have been handed over to me by my Father,
And none knoweth the Son save the Father;
Neither doth any know the Father save the Son
And he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him.

Matt. xi: 27; Luke x: 22.

This saying follows Jesus' thanksgiving to the Father that He has hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them unto babes. What "these things" are, we are left to surmise; but the "all things" which have been delivered to the Son are closely connected with the thought of divine revelation and

we may naturally suppose that the reference is to all the hidden things of the divine wisdom which Jesus possesses in plenitude. "These things" likewise would be the revelations of the heavenly truths which are given to the simple in heart, to those who accept for themselves the counsel of God. We are reminded of the first beatitude, "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." The complete reversion of conditions with a new standard of values, is God's plan for the new age. The Apostle Paul speaks similarly of God's wisdom in making the plan of salvation; the wise and understanding were blind to it; "seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God." Paul distinguished two kinds of wisdom: that which can be learned by human means and that which is divinely revealed. He speaks "God's wisdom in a mystery, and not in words which man's wisdom teacheth." Paul's thought about divine wisdom agrees with the idea in the Q passage under discussion, and both are consonant with the wisdom enunciated by the great Teacher, whose sayings while frequently assuming the familiar gnomic form, unfold a philosophy of life which runs directly counter to the philosophy contained in the gnomic literature of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Sirach. In these, wisdom leads men to wealth and honor. Jesus says, not the prosperous but the poor and sorrowful and despised are the truly blessed, "Lend freely, expecting nothing again, Love your enemies, who will not return your love."

The Book of Sirach closes with an invitation to get wisdom: "Come unto me ye unlearned." In the Greek translation of li:26 we read:

Put your neck under the yoke,
And let your soul receive instruction.

But in the original Hebrew it is:

Put your neck under her yoke,
And let your soul bear her burden.

which clearly recalls, "Come unto me all ye that labor" and "My yoke is easy and my burden is light."

This beautiful passage in Matthew's Gospel follows immediately the Christological passage discussed above, on the divine

revelation. Since it is not found in Luke, we have no certain ground for attributing it to Q; Q's fondness for wisdom might make it likely, but in any case, someone saw the connection between the divine revelation described in Q and the invitation issued by the Heavenly Wisdom to take her yoke and bear her burden. Perhaps it was the great Teacher himself who made the connection and reissued the old invitation in the name of Wisdom, the Wisdom that was present when God was making the world, herself "An unspotted mirror of the working of God." Speaking of the Jewish conception of wisdom Kohler says: "From this period [the period of Sirach, Wisdom, Enoch] two different currents of thought appeared. The one represented Wisdom as an independent being distinct from God, and this finally became merged under Platonic influence into the views of Neo-Platonism, Gnosticism and Christian dogma. The other identified the divine wisdom with the Torah: this view led back to strict monotheism."¹

Among the descriptions of Wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon we read:

She entered into the soul of a servant of the Lord,
And withstood terrible kings in wonders and signs.
(x: 16)

Q shows us the Servant of the Lord who is possessed by the divine Wisdom; of an incarnation in the full theological sense Q knows nothing. Paul declares that Christ is the power of God and the *wisdom* of God. The Epistle to the Hebrews goes farther and describes the eternal Son in words borrowed from The Wisdom of Solomon. As Wisdom was an "emanation of the glory of the Almighty, and an effulgence of everlasting light," so the Son was the "effulgence of the glory of God." As God through Wisdom created all things, so the Son created the worlds. As God speaks to the world through Wisdom, so He reveals himself through Christ.

This line of thought culminates in the Fourth Gospel which declares that Wisdom, through whom all things were made, became flesh and dwelt among us. The great Christological passage of Q finds its counterpart both in the prologue and in the body

¹ *Jewish Theology*, p. 141.

of the Gospel. "No one knoweth the Father save the Son" stands in Q. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" stands in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel.

O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I know thee: and these knew that thou didst send me; and I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known.

This prayer of the incarnate Wisdom or Logos parallels the great declaration of the Divine Wisdom in Q. It is probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel knew not only the Gospel of Mark but that of Luke which made use of Q. It may be that he knew Q as it existed separately, or that he knew other collections of Logia. For him, glorious Wisdom has actually assumed flesh and blood and has not figuratively but literally lived among men. Wisdom who assisted at creation and who found no dwelling place among men was incarnate in Jesus Christ. This is the pivotal idea in his whole Gospel. To be sure, he does not use the name Sophia, but Logos—which is to be translated Reason—perhaps because he prefers a masculine noun, or because he wishes to make use of the religious connotation inherent and familiar in Philo's broader term, Logos. In any case, "Reason" is an acceptable translation of the Hebrew word *Hokhma*, which is usually translated as Wisdom—preferable indeed, in the eighth chapter of Proverbs, a chapter which is echoed more than once in John's prologue. The inference is that there was an Aramaic stream of tradition connecting Jesus with Wisdom; it comes to the surface clearly in certain sayings in Q, but the whole document was colored by it. The Fourth Gospel knows still more of these sayings and from them has developed its main theme.

As we look at Q's portrait of Jesus, then, we may trace four main features:

1. He is the Messiah, but the Messiahship is Apocalyptic rather than national.
2. He is the Son of God through moral affinity with the Father.
3. He is the Servant, whose service has ministrant rather than sacrificial significance.
4. He is the divine Wisdom whose yoke is easy and whose burden is light.

The Synoptic Gospels reveal a strong interest in the cult which the followers of Jesus soon developed, and which has played an important part in the Christian religion ever since. Though possessed of a cult, the religion of the Jews was essentially ethical, not cultic. In Matthew and Luke the ethical side of the religion is more prominent than in Mark, for which we have to thank Q and the special source or sources of Luke. There are few traces of the cult in Q and such as there are may be due to redaction. Its outstanding character is that of the non-cultic memorial. All who look into the composition of the Gospels must acknowledge that through the centuries Q has been contributing a steady enrichment to the Christian religion on its ethical and intellectual side.

The emphasis of Q is upon the sincere, inner and spiritual quality of true religion. Q delineates the Master as exemplifying this religion, radiating its light to the group which surrounded Him, and ultimately throwing its beams to the uttermost parts of the earth.

RUTH STELLHORN MACKENSEN

Hartford, Connecticut

THE PRESENT LITERARY FORM OF THE
BALAAM STORY

THE PRESENT LITERARY FORM OF THE BALAAM STORY

By RUTH STELLHORN MACKENSEN

THE story of Balaam has always aroused considerable interest and endless conjectures among Jews, Christians, and Muslims. Of late years the presence of this queer narrative, imbedded in the law, and attempts to analyze it have occasioned difficulties for Biblical scholars. It becomes increasingly evident that the narrative of Numbers xxii: 2-xxiv breaks into the text of the book and must be handled as a separate literary creation. It has nothing to do with the material that precedes and follows. Hence, little can be judged from the context as to its purpose or its place in the history of Israel. The independence of this narrative was recognized long ago, in the Talmudic remark, "Moses wrote his own book and the section concerning Balaam, and Job."¹

Most interpretations of the Balaam story are colored by other Biblical and Rabbinic references. Balaam is usually considered the typical false prophet and archenemy of God and His people, Israel. Thus Biblical writers attribute to him the basest of motives; extra-Biblical Jewish authors, Josephus and Philo for instance, think him little short of a fiend; Christian commentators and preachers, beginning with the three New Testament allusions of 2 Peter ii: 15, Jude v: 11, and Revelation ii: 14, consider him the typical evil counsellor; and Muslim scholars have followed in the wake of their Jewish and Christian predecessors. Balaam has in consequence achieved an evil reputation and there are but a few words of praise for him.

In the past there has been too much concern with the person and character of Balaam. The classical example is the eighteenth century sermon of Bishop Butler, who saw in Balaam one who for avarice and self-seeking went against his own better nature and

¹ *Baba bathra*, 14b.

knowledge. A modern reaction to these adverse criticisms has made a great effort to give Balaam his due, although, one might add, at a lamentably late date.

With the undue emphasis on the person and character of Balaam, there has been far too little interest in the story and its purpose. As Gray has pointed out in his commentary on Numbers, the diviner is incidental, the important thing is the narrative itself. However, most modern critical scholars, while no longer concerned with the problems of the villain or hero, nevertheless have been involved in incidentals. The text of Numbers xxii: 2-xxiv has offered knotty problems for every one who has endeavored to resolve it into its sources, and most critics admit frankly that it is wellnigh impossible to divide the material into J and E with any certainty. Bewer, for example, objects to the usual analysis and has redivided the material quite ingeniously, producing two fairly complete stories, which he believes represent quite different points of view.

J, according to his analysis, tells how the elders of Midian and Moab sought help against Israel from Balaam, a typical old Arab seer, who by omens tried to ascertain the will of Jehovah. Apparently willing to curse the invaders, the soothsayer started out, but was intercepted (the ass episode). After learning Jehovah's will, he turned about to go home, and then a divine spirit came upon him and he uttered his oracle.

According to E, it is Balak who sent messengers. God appeared to Balaam as to any Hebrew prophet, at first forbidding him to go, but later, consenting, told him to bless, not curse. There is no artificial apparatus, no angel, no speaking ass. God simply put His words into the mouth of the prophet.

Bewer, following Holzinger, suggests that originally there was but one Balaam oracle, which came down in J and E recensions with variations and later additions. The redactor, for his own purposes, has included both versions, and has split them up into several oracles.²

The present writer does not purpose to go into all of the manifold and interesting problems presented by the story and poems,

² J. Bewer: "Literary Problems of the Balaam Story in Numbers, chapters 22-24," *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. IX.

but rather, to discuss the motives underlying their final form as an example of the value of the literary method, supplementary to the purely analytical and critical. Students of Professor Macdonald have carried from his classroom an appreciation of just this method of viewing the Old Testament. We have learned to approach the Bible afresh, viewing it as a rich, though fragmentary, collection of several types of literature. It is to be studied for its own sake as *literature* and not merely as sources for the history of Israel nor as a body of texts to prove theological theories.

One important step in the literary study of the Old Testament is a recognition of these various literary forms and their characteristics. Professor Macdonald has pointed out among the different Hebrew stories, one type in which a sophisticated religious artist utilizes old traditional material to present his own thesis.³ The original legends are apparent and may exist apart as in the prologue and epilogue of Job. Or, more commonly, they are incorporated in the new form, as in the book of Jonah, the early stories of Genesis, and the book of Daniel. In general these writers evince a broad philosophical outlook and present original points of view. Their lessons are to be detected in the manner in which the sources have been handled, bits chosen here and there, and set over against one another to lead up to the point of the story. While these fragments are often taken in entirety from the originals, the arrangement is intentional and undoubtedly there are phrases, verses, and sections from the pen of the later writer. The hand of the "redactor" is recognized frequently in critical analyses of texts, but too often there is no realization that he had both purpose and method.

It sometimes appears, that, in our zeal to analyze the "historical books" of the Old Testament into sources, we have forgotten

³ See D. B. Macdonald: "Some External Evidence on the Original Form of the Legend of Job," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XIV, and "The Pre-Abrahamic Stories of Genesis, as a Part of the Wisdom Literature," in Glasgow University *Studia Semitica et Orientalia*; also Joshua Finkel, "Old Israelitish Tradition in the Koran," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 1930-1931. Dr. Finkel here applies Professor Macdonald's method to the study of several Old Testament stories.

that the "redactor," "editor," "final compiler," or whatever he is called, had a purpose in mind and a message which it is our task to understand. Often he is made the goat on which is loaded those verses, which cannot be attributed easily to the several recognized documents, on the basis of accepted theories as to their characteristic words, phrases, theology, and so on. It is time that we recognize him as more than a "redactor." He is a literary artist with a definite viewpoint of his own. Otherwise he will appear as no more than an intelligent child with a literary jig-saw puzzle, of two, three or four "documents," which he is attempting to cut into pieces and fit together to make one instead of several accounts. This is unfair to him. Whatever his motives in preserving old material, they were hardly simple or single. He felt a reverence for literary remnants of the past, respect for diverse opinions—such as Muslim commentators certainly have evinced—and the necessity of keeping familiar language, as any one must who tells stories to children and simple folk. Nevertheless, there is abundant evidence that he made conscious selections from his material. True, this artist—or rather these literary artists, for they must have been numerous—have not always done their work as skilfully as might be wished. Sometimes the sources were not sufficiently knit into a new whole, so that they, rather than the final form, catch one's attention. But repeated and unbiased reading of the stories, especially in Hebrew, will often bring to light the purposes underlying their present form. It is my contention that this is a task much in need of being done, if the Old Testament is to be thoroughly understood and appreciated.

The story of Balaam seems a case in point. Forgetting the usual analysis into documents, one who reads and rereads Numbers xxii: 2- xxiv is led to the impression that, in spite of admitted inconsistencies, the narrative holds together as a unity. It stands apart from the rest of the book of Numbers. When it was written and how it came to be included in the law are problems requiring more discussion than space here permits. On the whole, the writer handled his material skilfully so that his story bears the marks, not so much of a compilation of sources, as of a reworking of them for a definite end.

Most studies of the account of Balaam have given the motive far too little attention. A. R. S. Kennedy⁴ recognizes that the present literary form of this episode is something different from that of its sources, and sees a twofold purpose, "to show the futility of all attempts, on the part of man, to foil the purpose of God, and to give expression, at the moment when they were about to enter the land of promise, to the glorious future which God had in store for the people of His choice." C. A. Dinsmore⁵ holds that the story of Balaam fits well with the main purpose of the book of Numbers, showing how futile are the enchantments of heathen seers to resist the intentions of the God of Israel. Canon Gray, in his commentary on Numbers, gives more than the usual attention to the purpose of the final narrative, which he considers to be the same as that underlying the two sources (J and E). "In the main the episode is a creation of the Hebrew national spirit in the days of national prosperity, and self-confidence sprung from reliance on the national God, Yahweh . . . the overruling thought is Yahweh's power to defend His people and His purposes of good concerning them; and the fatal madness of those who, through them oppose Him."⁶ Gray further points out that this motive was felt by Micah.⁷

The present writer, however, is not satisfied that the motive presented by Gray is adequate, and as a basis of further study suggests a comparison with the early declaration of monotheism made in Amos ix: 7-10. Amos asserts that the men of Israel cannot excuse their unrighteousness on the ground that Jehovah, having led them from Egypt, can do nothing else than favor them. He has led other nations too; He is the God of the whole world, the one God, who will judge His people according to their faithfulness; He will sift them and punish the sinners with death.

In like manner, our author has a message concerning Jehovah's supremacy, but instead of approaching it from the favorite historical argument concerning the exodus, his interest is in Jehovah's control over the whole spirit realm. Like the author of the

⁴ "Leviticus and Numbers," in the *New Century Bible*, pp. 315 f.

⁵ *The English Bible as Literature*, p. 156.

⁶ pp. 315, 316.

⁷ Mic. vi: 5.

Jonah tract he is giving a thrust at the growing Hebrew exclusiveness. Jonah needed to learn that the God of Israel has a concern for other peoples too. Our author wants to remind his fellow Israelites that Jehovah, the one and only God, is the center of the whole unseen world, in fact He is the *unseen*, there is no divination, no prophecy apart from His guidance. In times past He has even used one of the heathen, Balaam the diviner, to carry out His purpose to bless Israel.⁸

Perhaps we have here, also, a piece of anti-prophetic propaganda. The prophetic party—the reference is of course to the great pre-exilic prophets—had been advancing claims of their unique and exclusive right to interpret the will of Jehovah. They alone were His mouthpieces. Can we imagine that such arrogance went unchallenged? Priests and seers, the sons of the prophets who received a backhand slap from Amos,⁹ as well as the common people must have united in protest against those who would invalidate all services save their own. We can hardly suppose that the efforts to do away with images or the commands to abolish all local shrines and temples in favor of Jerusalem were accepted without a struggle. So too we may surmise that the prophetic claims aroused bitter opposition. We know there were frequent outcroppings of image worship, and in emergencies people and kings resorted to various forms of divination and magic. Certainly the priests were never discredited, even though as time went on their original and primary function as casters of the sacred lots gave way or became inferior to that as ministrants in the temple. As a matter of fact the prophetic ideal did not make a clean sweep: it was the law not the prophets that dominated Jewish religion. May we not advance the hypothesis that the author of the Balaam story came to the problem of Jehovah's omnipotence, not as Amos from the prophetic side, but from that of those whom the prophets would discredit? A study of the terms used of Balaam and his dealings with the unseen is suggestive.

⁸ I am much indebted to Professor Macdonald, for this paper has grown out of the reading, with him, of this story in Hebrew. However, he must not be held responsible for the development of this thesis.

⁹ Amos vii : 14.

It is noteworthy and somewhat surprising that nowhere in the Old Testament is he called a נביא and only in 2 Peter ii: 16 is he called ὁ προφήτης. Although Balaam is given no professional title in Numbers xxii-xxiv, the terms used of his activities make it clear that he was considered a diviner. The elders of Moab and Edom came to him bearing קסמים¹⁰ and in one of his utterances Balaam declares there is no קסם effective against Israel.¹¹ In Joshua xiii: 22 he is referred to as הקוסם. As a parallel to קסם the same oracle¹² states there is no נחש effective against Jacob. After several discouraging experiences we are told¹³ that Balaam "went not as at other times to meet with נחשים." He is a man who gives forth oracular utterance (נאם),¹⁴ and knows well the intimate knowledge of God יודע דעה עליון¹⁵ and if we accept Kuenen's emendation of Numbers xxiii: 3 to [לב] שפי [ם] or [י] שפי [י] for וילך שפי, he utilizes magical appliances (using Robertson-Smith's definition of כשפים). Balaam claims in his oracles to have seen a vision מראה שדי.¹⁶ He speaks of falling into trances נפל וגלוי עינים,¹⁷ he "sees" (ראה) various peoples¹⁸ and the messenger of Jehovah¹⁹ hears the words of אל, ²⁰Jehovah comes in to him²¹ and he meets God,²² a divine spirit comes upon him.²³ The curses desired of him and the blessings he gives instead are magical entities. These terms and descriptions of his activities and even more the whole tenor of the story bespeak the fact that he is one in immediate contact with the spirit world and definitely a mouthpiece of Jehovah.

In his study of the types of divination and magic condemned in Deuteronomy xviii: 10, 11,²⁴ Robertson Smith has shown that the terms used are not a piling up of synonyms for rhetorical effect but are precise descriptions of different techniques of divination and magic. קסם, he defines as an oracle or other divination by the

¹⁰ Num. xxii: 7.

¹¹ Num. xxiii: 23.

¹² Num. xxiii: 23.

¹³ Num. xxiv: 1.

¹⁴ Num. xxiv: 3, 4, 15, 16.

¹⁵ Num. xxiv: 16.

¹⁶ Num. xxiv: 4, 16.

¹⁷ Num. xxiv: 2 and according to LXX also xxiii: 6.

¹⁸ *Journal of Philology*, Vols. XIII and XIV.

¹⁷ Num. xxiv: 4, 16.

¹⁸ Num. xxiv: 20, 21.

¹⁹ Num. xxii: 31.

²⁰ Num. xxiv: 4, 16.

²¹ Num. xxii: 9, 20.

²² Num. xxiii: 3, 4, 15, 16.

sacra of a god, נחש is a divination by natural omens or presages, and כשפים are magical appliances used by a diviner or magician. Taking these terms as used in the Balaam story together with the descriptions of Balaam's professional activities, one is brought to the suggestion that he is made a type of the various diviners, magicians and workers in the supernatural who were condemned by the prophets and in the Deuteronomic code. It is beside the point to question whether one man actually used various techniques in his uncanny operations. That does not concern our author; his purpose is to show that these techniques are legitimate methods of communication with Jehovah who controls and has actually used them. Balaam himself, then, is important only as a typical agent of Jehovah.

In like manner the writer is not concerned primarily with the character of Balaam and the purity of his motives. He pictures a man completely controlled by God. One of his sources may have described a heathen diviner, eager to curse the invading Israel but prevented by Jehovah, another may have portrayed Balaam as a typical Hebrew prophet who like Micaiah of 1 Kings xxii: 14 is the willing mouthpiece of God. If he knew the stories of Balaam's responsibility for sin of the young Israelites with the daughters of Midian²⁵ he avoided using them. But, like the authors of Jonah, the Job poems, and probably the "redactors" of much of the material of the Hexateuch and Samuel, he used his legendary sources freely to teach his own lesson.

As a good Hebrew story-teller he has the task of making his story palatable to his hearers, even though, or, perhaps one should say, all the more, because his purpose is didactic. This in a measure limits him, but also tests his ability as a narrator and as a teacher. He is limited by the fact that he is using material familiar to his hearers. The stories and oracles of Balaam are well known, he cannot do too great violence to the accepted traditions, he must include familiar incidents and phrases. Probably it was very natural for him to slip into the oft-repeated words. This in a large measure will account for the inconsistencies in his story. He

²⁵ Num. xxxi: 8, 16.

is weaving together bits from various sources and feels he must preserve them.

The most glaring inconsistency is the ass incident. Here as has often been pointed out the author is probably giving one of his sources *verbatim*. But suppose that he should have wished to leave out this familiar but inconvenient episode in order to make his narrative entirely consistent. He is at once confronted with a problem. Knowing his audience he must not, to save his face as a story-teller, and even more his lesson, permit himself to be interrupted. He must include some of the familiar embellishments and get on as fast as he can to his point. Nor can he change the incident appreciably; too often had his hearers chuckled at the discomfiture of the prophet when the ass spoke up, and again, how they nodded when the angel points out what should have been self-evident to one whose chief function presumably is to know the purposes of Jehovah. And so, convenient or not, he must leave the ass episode intact, include and tell it in its oft-repeated words. He must do this well if his story is to be appreciated and win the respect of his audience. Then only can he get on to what in his estimation is vastly more important, his lesson regarding the control Jehovah exercises over all the spirit realm and uses in behalf of his chosen people.

A homely and perhaps trivial analogy may make his problem clear. Imagine a modern moralizing educator who decides to tell a group of small children a pretty story, to teach kindness and consideration for the old and infirm. In her zeal, she seizes upon the familiar tale of Red Riding Hood but is shocked at the idea of telling the innocent little ones about the dreadful wolf who ate up the grandmother. So she decides to omit him. She tries her reconstructed and purified tale on a child who has heard the old story time and again. All goes beautifully for a while and then an insistent voice is raised, "But you forgot the wolf, tell me about the wolf." The moralist is perturbed but attempts to explain that this is a much nicer story. Again, cries for the wolf, and soon the well intentioned teacher is silenced. If she persists to the bitter end she is likely to discover that her lesson in altruism has been missed entirely and the child has carried away only the idea that this woman really doesn't know all about Red Riding

in plain terms tells him to go home and without pay or honor.²⁸ But Balaam is not to be outdone; he will have the last word and gives Balak one more oracle, this time unsolicited. In it he not only prophesies the future greatness of Israel, but predicts the downfall of Moab at the hands of a leader of that very Israel. Balak will not pay him, well, he will get more than he asked for, a curse on his own people. The final oracles against the nations are obviously tacked on and add nothing to the story. They may have been appended by the story-teller himself, in order to preserve all the words traditionally ascribed to Balaam, or, if it can be proved as Von Gall²⁹ maintained, that they are post-exilic, then someone else has put them here as the obvious place for them. The story-teller has told his tale, he has made his point, but did it, as we say, "get over"?

Judging from other references to Balaam in the Bible and in subsequent literature, Rabbinic, Samaritan, Christian and Muslim he was not successful. Perhaps he was too subtle; perhaps he chose the wrong medium for his lesson and beguiled his hearers with entertainment rather than edification. In the end, popular legend and the exclusive religious spirit prevailed, and the heathen prophet came to be viewed as irregular and ultimately as definitely hostile to Israel. It may be well to give a brief review of these later attitudes toward the Balaam story.

As mentioned before, the chief concern has been with the problems of his character. Some of the Rabbis, however, have sensed that there was a purpose to the story, or rather for them, to the historical incident. The heathen shall never be able to reproach Jehovah with not having given them a chance. They had their prophets, Shem, Job, his three friends and Balaam. The last especially was sent to them as Moses to the Israelites.³⁰ The heathen did not listen to their teachers, and Balaam, by his misuse of his gift, shows why God thereafter withheld the gift of prophecy from the nations.³¹

²⁸ Num. xxiv : 10 f.

²⁹ Von Gall, *Bileam-Perikope*, pp. 17 f.

³⁰ See Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, Vol. III, pp. 354-6 for instances and references.

³¹ *Midrash Bemidbar Rabbah* (ed. Wilna, 1887), 20 : 1 ; *Midrash Tan-*

Balaam rose from the rank of an interpreter of dreams to that of a prophet, but because of his unfaithfulness sank again to that of a mere diviner.³² In general he is seen as a false prophet, the typical enemy of Israel who wanted to curse Israel because he was jealous that he was not the one chosen to lead the exodus and deliver the Torah.³³ The method of divine intervention is variously described, but the essential idea in each case is that Balaam, powerless in the hands of Jehovah, was forced to bless Israel. Evidences of his total depravity are found in every word and action. His failure to meet the test put to him by God was due to his arrogance. A shrewd man, he knew that he could render the messenger of Jehovah powerless by saying, "I have sinned." Although he was unable to curse Israel, he offered Balak a method, by which the wrath of God could be brought down upon His own people. The details of Balaam's responsibility for the sin of the men of Israel with the women of Midian, which, ultimately, led to his own death, have been amplified endlessly. This inability, or unwillingness, to appreciate the purpose of the Balaam story goes far back, for we have its beginnings, although without the later embellishments, in the Old Testament.³⁴

The New Testament authors carry on the same estimate of Balaam. The Jewish and Christian hatred for him seems to be derived from two sources, one or more legends, which describe him as eager to curse Israel, but prevented, and a later exclusiveness, which could not tolerate the idea of a true prophet among the heathen. Although nowhere in the Old Testament is he referred to as a נביא, and the term הקוסם in Joshua xiii: 22 is probably one of contempt, it is curious that Rabbinic writers did not hesitate to call him a prophet.

The Samaritan book of the *Secrets of Moses*—the *Asatir*—and its commentary the *Pitron* furnish further evidence of the

huma (ed. Buber, Wilna, 1885), Vol. IV, p. 132; *Tanḥuma* (Balak) (ed. Schechter, Wilna, 1887), *Kohleth* 3: 18, *Yalkuṭ* 771, and *Sanhedrin*.

³² *The Biblcal Antiquities of Pseudo Philo*, 18: 11, 17D, 18:2; *Targum Yerushalmi*, Num. xxii: 5; Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 371.

³³ *Batte Midrashot*, Vol. IV, p. 5.

³⁴ Num. xxxi: 8, 16; Deut. xxiii: 4—quoted Neh. xiii: 2, Joshua xiii: 22, xxiv: 9, 10. For the Rabbinic material see Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, Vol. III, pp. 353 ff.; also *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, art. "Balaam."

perennial interest in Balaam. Most of the material can be traced to Jewish sources, but there are a few unique elements, most interesting of which are the names of the seven angels (מלאכה) worshipped by Balaam. They are really the gods of the elements which he adored. Strangely enough, it is these seven, not Jehovah, who put the words of blessing into the wizard's mouth.³⁵ This curious statement occurs in verse 9: אֵל הַקְדוֹשׁ מְלָאכָה דְקָדָם לְבָלְעָם. *El ha Qadōsh* is the name of one of the seven. Gaster says the present-day Samaritans have no adequate explanation of the meaning of *El ha Qadōsh* but simply say it is the name of one of the idols worshipped by Balaam. He thinks that here in the *Asatir* are remnants of a very old tradition, which may have its roots in some such Persian system as that mentioned by Herodotus.³⁶ Possibly, also, the *Asatir* drew from some magical writings attributed to Balaam which are referred to in the Talmud.³⁷ Although, for Samaritan tradition, the seven angels or demons are Balaam's idols, one cannot but wonder if in *El ha Qadōsh* there is a dim recollection of the idea that Jehovah, the holy God, controls the whole spirit realm. However, this may be a survival of an ancient polytheism, in which the God of Israel was simply one of a pantheon, served by Balaam. If it was once a part of the original form of the Balaam story, it is precisely the sort of thing which Biblical writers would have suppressed. On the other hand, it may simply be a later device to avoid making Balaam a worshiper of Jehovah.

Muslim traditions concerning Balaam do not differ greatly from the Jewish. It is interesting to note that the Jewish objection to the presence of a true prophet of Jehovah among the heathen has been carried one step further by al-Rāzī. Expressing the later Muslim repugnance for the possibilities of a prophet ever falling from the faith, he says that Balaam was not a prophet but only a man who had been taught by Allāh and knew His religion but later fell into unbelief.³⁸

³⁵ *The Asatir, the Samaritan Book of the "Secrets of Moses," together with the Pitron or Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses*, Royal Asiatic Society, London, 1927, Vol. X, pp. 6-17.

³⁶ *ibid.*, p. 131.

³⁷ *ibid.*, p. 122.

³⁸ *Mafāṭih*, Vol. IV, p. 313, Cairo 1308. For a brief résumé of the place

There are a few favorable comments on Balaam but they are scattered and hardly affect the general tone of condemnation. Micah vi: 5 is the only Biblical passage which shows any appreciation for the work of Balaam. There he appears in the goodly company of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, and his answer to Balak is an evidence of Jehovah's righteous dealing with His people. In Rabbinic literature there are a few expressions of approval. *Aggadit Bereshit* 65, 130 (Cracow 1902) makes Balaam answer the messengers, "I cannot undertake to do any evil against Israel with whom the Lord is." Moses, the greatest prophet of the Jews, and Balaam, the greatest of the Gentiles, is a favorite contrast in haggadic literature. At times he is even called the peer of Moses, inferior neither in wisdom nor in the gift of prophecy. In one way he was superior, for Moses had to pray to God "to show him His ways," whereas Balaam was the one man who could declare of himself that he "knew the knowledge of the most High."³⁹ In commenting on Deuteronomy xxiv: 10, "There hath not risen in Israel a prophet like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face," *Siphre* adds, "but among the heathen there has, viz., Balaam."

Possibly Muslim tradition preserves unwittingly one more appreciation of the heathen prophet. There is no space here for a discussion of the possible identification of Balaam with Luqmān, the pre-Islāmic sage, to whom Muḥammad devoted the thirty-first sūra. This identification rests chiefly on the synonymous meanings of the two names—*בלע* = *لقم* to swallow, to devour⁴⁰—the statement "*Balaam qui lingua Arabica vocatur Lucaman*,"⁴¹ and the genealogies of Balaam, son of Beor and Luqmān, son of Bā'ūr. In the Qur'ān xxxi: 12, Luqmān, enjoining monotheism on his son, says, ". . . for joining gods with Allāh is great impiety." By describing Luqmān as one of his forerunners in proclaiming the true religion, Muḥammad makes him a prophet without giving him that title. In the Qur'ānic statements and in the general pre- of Balaam in Muslim tradition, see *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, art. "Bal'am," by D. B. Macdonald, 1913.

³⁹ Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 356.

⁴⁰ *Lisān al-'Arab*, Vol. XIV, p. 322.

⁴¹ *Auctore Petro Alphonso*, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* Vol. 157, col. 673.

Islāmic and Muslim respect and admiration for Luqmān, is it too far-fetched to find a faint echo of the lesson of Numbers xxii-xxiv, and the favorable light in which Balaam is there represented?⁴²

Professor Macdonald has pointed out that it is the patient Job of the prose narrative, and not the Job of the philosopher-poet, who has survived. So too, with Jonah, men have stumbled so often over the difficulties presented by the legendary features in the book, notably the great fish, that they have failed to appreciate the real message of religious toleration and humanitarianism. Such is also the case with the story of Balaam. One might cite numerous other examples to show how the old legendary elements have persisted in popular and theological interpretations to the loss of the great ideas of the later writers who clothed their lessons in story form.

This appears to be the unfortunate fate of the ideas of the more philosophical and liberal minds who opposed Jewish exclusiveness. This lack of appreciation for their opinions has gone so far that we have been told not infrequently that the Hebrews had no philosophy, that their minds did not work that way. It is generally recognized that Biblical history is not pure history, but history rewritten for a purpose, to teach a lesson. The motives of the Chronicler are very apparent. The books of Samuel are more than the story of David, they are also prophetic propaganda. A careful literary study also of the Hexateuch is a necessary supplement to the critical and analytical method, but much that has been called a "literary study" does not deserve the name. Important as it is to discover, if possible, the sources, their characteristic language and points of view, and to discriminate between history and legend, it is essential that we also recognize the points of view and the lessons of the *final compilers*. Some of the necessary methods have been suggested in this article. But after all the important thing is to be able to sense the flavor of the whole, which can only be done by coming to one's reading without pre-

⁴² On the Balaam-Luqmān problem see E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, art. "Luqmān"; C. H. Toy, "The Lokmān-legend," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XIII.

conceptions. In a word one must have literary taste.⁴³ Such a reader will be likely to discover that the philosophy of the Hebrews, or rather the philosophies of individual Hebrews, is by no means to be found only in the few *wisdom* writings.

⁴³ For the new values to be gained from a purely literary approach to the Old Testament, it will be interesting to see Professor Macdonald's forthcoming book, which will be a publication of his *Hebrew Literary Genus* lectures given for so many years at the Hartford Theological Seminary. In this there will be a discussion of the Balaam story.

JOHN E. MERRILL

President of Aleppo College, Aleppo, Syria

A CHRISTIAN "WORD OF TESTIMONY"
FOR USE WITH MUSLIMS

A CHRISTIAN "WORD OF TESTIMONY" FOR USE WITH MUSLIMS

By JOHN E. MERRILL

DR. MACDONALD, whose anniversary we delight to honor, is a vigorous exponent of the intimate relationship between scholarship and service. One need not hesitate, then, to offer a study with practical bearings for this commemorative volume.

"There is no god but God, and Muḥammad is One Sent of God." Is there a Christian "Word of Testimony," corresponding to this classic sentence of Islām, for use in presenting the Christian message to Muslims?

I

Such a Word of Testimony might be made up from the Gospels by combining the *Shema'* of Israel as quoted in Mark (xii: 29, *cf.* LXX) and references to Jesus as One Sent of God: "The Lord our God is One Lord, and Jesus is the Sent of God."

The Gospel according to John contains a striking parallel: "That they might know Thee the One true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent" (xvii: 3, according to the Greek).

Al-Ghazzālī, in a remarkable passage occurring in *al-Qusṭās al-mustaqīm*, frames a Word of Testimony for a Christian, and says that a Muslim should concur in it.

Should some say to thee, "Say: There is but One God and Jesus is His prophet," thy mind would instinctively reject the statement as being proper to a Christian only. But that would but be because thou hast not sufficient understanding to grasp that the statement in itself is true, and that *no reproach can be made to the Christian for this article of his faith, nor for any of the other articles, save only these two—that God is the third of three, and that Muḥammad is not a prophet of God. Apart from these two, all the other articles [of the Christian faith] are true.*¹

¹ Quoted by Asín: *Islam and the Divine Comedy*, p. 81, and the italics are his; brought to my attention by Dr. E. E. Calverley of the Kennedy School of Missions.

"The Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" is often used as a concise statement of the Christian message. But, unless the statement is explained in a specifically Christian sense, Muslims profess a similar belief.

II

The Words of Testimony in Islām were a natural, independent development—the testimony to the Divine Unity from the preaching of Muḥammad, the testimony to Muḥammad's prophetship from the impression made by him upon his followers. The Words of Testimony were in use as such at the house of Arqam at Mecca, and were carried to Yathrib by the first teacher sent there. They occur literally in Qur'ānic passages from al-Madīna (xlvi: 21; xlviii: 29) and essentially in very early passages from Mecca (lxxiii: 9, 15; cxii: lxviii: 2, 44). When Abū Bakr became khalīfa, he was greeted as "Master of the Two Testimonies."

The precedence of the Testimony to the Divine Unity is evident from the Traditions, although confession of the Divine Unity implied acceptance of Muḥammad's prophetship. Sufyān ibn 'Abdallāh al-Sakfi reported:

I said to the prophet: Inform me in the matter of Islām, that I may have no occasion to ask others about it hereafter. He replied: Say, O Sufyān, I believe in God; after which, obey the commandments and abandon the things forbidden.²

Wahb ibn Munabbih reported:

People asked him [Muḥammad] if to say: There is no god but God, was not the key to paradise. He said: Yes—but it is a key which has wards.³

The Words of Testimony have a value for the inner life, according to the Traditions. 'Abdallāh ibn Amr reported:

The Apostle of God said: Saying . . . "There is no god but God" leaves no curtain between him and God, till he reaches Him.⁴

Abū Hurairah reported:

The Apostle of God said: No servant has said "There is no god but God" with an unsullied heart, but the doors of the regions are opened for him, until he reaches the imperial throne, that is, God; so long as he abstains from great crimes.⁵

² *Mishkātū'l-Maṣābīḥ*, translation by Matthews.

³ *Mishkāt*.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

The Words of Testimony are not to be considered as constituting the Creed of Islām. They are recognized as an abridged Outline (*ijmāl*) of Faith. But a believer who knows only the Two Testimonies is responsible for learning also as soon as possible

to confirm from the heart and to confess by word of mouth these Six Articles: God, the angels, the Books, the prophets, the Day of Judgment, and the appointment of good and evil by God.⁶

The thesis that "the Formula of Unity includes all the attributes of God and of the prophets" formed the title of a book by al-Sanūsī (d. 1486). But one of the creedal statements of al-Ghazzālī (d. 1111) required several thousand words.

The Words of Testimony have stood from the first as the distinguishing, declarative symbol of Islām. For the individual, they have served as a confession to God, a witness to men, and a minimum basis for religious thought. For the community, they have served as a means of identification, and their frequent repetition everywhere in Islām has promoted a consciousness of solidarity. For the spread of Islām, they have served as a message, and as a test of faith, their repetition providing a simple method of entrance into the brotherhood of Islām. Has Christianity a corresponding Word of Testimony?

III

It is said that Christian thought is too complicated to allow of such a simple statement. This is to confuse the Words of Testimony with a creed, and may be an evasion of the question. No evasion clouded the testimony of Christodoulos, patriarch of Cairo (1044-1077). Over the doorway of his church might be read the inscription in Arabic: "In the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, One God." The Fatimite Khalīfa ordered it defaced. "You cannot erase the words from my heart," was the response.

It may be said with truth that Christianity has accomplished in other ways what has been done by the Words of Testimony for Islām. Observances such as baptism, the sign of the cross, the

⁶ Mou'allim Irshad in his Turkish *Malumat-ı-Diniye*.

Lord's Day, the communion, have distinguished Christians from Jews and pagans. These observances have had an unmistakable significance as Christian testimony. Baptism has meant renunciation of sin and dedication to Christ, the cross has preached the death of Christ, as the Lord's Day has His resurrection, and the communion has witnessed to dependence on Christ, not on Jewish ceremonial. The creed of the church, brief enough to be committed to memory and recited in unison, has been used as a form of confession to God and before men. In it has been seen the irreducible minimum of Christian truth. Its universal acceptance has given substance to the ideal of one holy, catholic church. It has been the symbol of orthodoxy, and men have been admitted to the Christian fellowship by confession of its beliefs.

When we seek to formulate a simpler Christian Word of Testimony, certain fundamental differences between Christianity and Islām must be kept in mind. (1) Islām stands for the Unity of God, and an intellectual proposition is the natural form in which to express this testimony. Christianity stands for a special manifestation of the Grace of God, testimony to which requires a different type of expression. (2) Islām calls for adherence to a truth about the Divine Being, and such adherence depends on intellectual conviction. Christianity summons to personal loyalty, which depends on historical fact and personal experience. (3) The purpose of Muḥammad was the establishment of a monotheistic religion, and for this a witness to the Unity of God was the necessary foundation. But this purpose was not the purpose of Jesus, and the Christian Word of Testimony will be suited to His aim. (4) The Testimony of the Unity of God was the message of Islām to a polytheistic community. Christianity presupposes monotheism; and its offer, whether to monotheists or to polytheists, is Jesus Christ. "Islām has no Saviour," said the famous Persian-Turkish Christian known as Avedaranian (Son of the Good News). The Christian Word of Testimony is about Christ.

IV

The New Testament yields a distinctive, essential, experiential Word of Testimony, simple as the Testimony of Islām. It is ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ—JESUS IS LORD.

The letters of Paul show this statement in use among the early Christians as a Word of Testimony. Before A.D. 60, he wrote to Christian groups at Rome, largely if not entirely unknown to him: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth JESUS IS LORD, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x: 9.) In discussing characteristic phases of Christian spiritual life for the church at Corinth, he began with the witness JESUS IS LORD, defining it as the experiential, initial Christian testimony. (1 Cor. xii: 3.) Other passages (2 Cor. iv: 5; Phil. ii: 11) afford confirmation, but especially his constant use of THE LORD as a title for Jesus, beginning from his earliest epistles. Once the Aramaic MARAN creeps in (1 Cor. xvi: 22) and points to popular usage of much earlier origin. The account in Acts of the beginnings of the Christian movement agrees: "God has made him LORD." (Acts ii: 36.) The expression "The Name," which appears immediately (ii: 38), which the disciples are forbidden to spread abroad (iv: 18, *cf.* vss. 7, 10, 12, 30), for which they suffered shame (v: 41), refers to this dignity and authority of Jesus. Almost in passing, Paul characterized the Christians (1 Cor. i: 2) as those "that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours," a description with which Pliny, the pagan observer, is in accord in his oft-quoted letter.

This spontaneous expression of the Christian consciousness involves peculiar difficulties for Muslims. (1) RABB, the Arabic word for LORD, is in use by them as a title for God in the sense of the theology of Islām. (2) Any Word of Testimony in this propositional form will appear to Muslims an intellectual statement, similar to their own Words of Testimony, to be weighed and accepted or rejected. (3) The use of such a title for Jesus will be regarded as "excessive praise," against which Muḥammad warned his followers. (4) In any case, those who do not share the spiritual experience which has given rise to this Word of Testimony cannot appreciate its meaning. A clear testimony in the mouth of the Christian believer, it is a sealed book as the Muslim hears it. Can a different form of statement be found that will convey the Christian testimony to Muslims without misunderstanding?

V

The descriptive titles used for Jesus in the Qur'ān, "the Messiah . . . son of Mary . . . an apostle of God . . . His word which He conveyed into Mary . . . a Spirit proceeding from Himself" (iv: 169), are obviously without relation to Christian experience and will not help us, except that 'ĪSĀ AL-MASĪḤ has passed into the common language as a name for Jesus, and may be used with freedom.

The title "Son" of God has always been misunderstood in Islām. The protests of Muḥammad, "God does not beget and is not begotten" (cxii: 3),⁷ "How when He hath no consort should He have a son?" (vi: 101), reveal a physical, polytheistic background of thought that is alien to Christianity.

Other descriptive titles used in the New Testament appeal to Christians, but have few active connotations for Muslims. Jesus is the "Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (1 Pet. ii: 25), the "Great Shepherd" (Heb. xiii: 20), the "Head of the Church" (Eph. i: 22), the "High-priest," the "Author of eternal salvation," the "Bringer-near of a new covenant" (Heb. iv: 14; v: 9; ix: 15; xii: 24), the "Prince of Life" (Acts iii: 15), "our Saviour" (2 Pet. i: 1). With a turn of expression which has a modern sound, Paul calls Him "life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. xv: 45).

Certainly some of these testimonies may be used upon occasion. Yet any statement in propositional form tends to provoke discussion, to start a process of discriminating thought, leading to an intellectual conclusion as to its truth or falsity.

VI

A non-controversial form of experiential witness is possible by the use of a verb of action, telling what Jesus does as Lord.

There are New Testament precedents for this sort of testimony. "He who ministers the Spirit to you and energizes works of power." (Gal. iii: 5; *cf.* Phil. i: 19.) Paul tells of the activity of Jesus in his own life (e.g. 2 Cor. xii: 9; xiii: 3; Phil. iv: 13; Col. i: 29). Through the "Name" of Jesus believers become possessors of forgiveness (Acts x: 43), the Holy Spirit (Acts ii:

⁷ Rodwell.

38), physical strength, in one case (Acts iii: 16), life eternal (John xx: 31), changed character (1 Cor. vi: 11).

A beautiful, fresh witness of this sort to Christ's present power is borne by the inscription on an early Christian gravestone, brought to light by my wife among the antiquities in the courtyard of a Greek physician at Antioch in Syria. It reads Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΤΤΟΥ Ο ΒΟΗΘΩΝ—GOD AND HIS CHRIST, THE HELPER. The natural testimony of Christian experience tells today of the help of Christ.

Let us say, then, JESUS CHRIST IMPARTS FORGIVENESS AND NEW LIFE. Such a Word of Testimony is distinctive, essential, experiential. And it is dynamic. Its purpose is that men should possess the experience to which it witnesses. It raises no adventitious questions. Its natural consequence is not an argument, but an experiment.

BARNETTE MILLER

*Associate Professor of History, Wellesley College,
Wellesley, Massachusetts*

THE CURRICULUM OF THE PALACE SCHOOL
OF THE TURKISH SULTANS

THE CURRICULUM OF THE PALACE SCHOOL OF THE TURKISH SULTANS

By BARNETTE MILLER

As an introduction to this article, the reader is referred to the following sections in Miss Miller's book "Beyond the Sublime Porte" (Yale University Press 1931).

- Chap. I, pp. 3-4: "All the world . . . Turkish lands."
p. 6: "Interest in the Grand Seraglio . . . less interesting."
Chap. III, pp. 47-51: "Among the Institutions . . . captured, or turned Turk."
pp. 53-7: "There exists, fortunately . . . in Galata Saray."
p. 59: "At the time of its fullest expansion . . . outside the House of Felicity."
pp. 61-3: "The teaching staff . . . corresponding grade."

THE type of governing official which the Turkish sultans desired to produce through the medium of their system of palace education was the warrior-statesman and loyal Muslim, who, at the same time, should be "a man of letters and a gentleman of polished speech, profound courtesy, and honest morals."¹ To this end a student of the Palace School of the Grand Seraglio, or of its three affiliated schools, from the day of his admission until his graduation, was meticulously drilled in the ceremonies of the Muslim religion and Turkish etiquette; he received instruction also, in almost equal proportions, in the liberal arts, physical exercises, and vocational training—a remarkable combination in the Middle Ages, or indeed, in any age.² The liberal arts, in the Turkish, or Islāmic, interpretation of the term, embraced the Turkish, Arabic, and Persian languages; Turkish and Persian literatures; Arabic grammar and syntax; a study of the Qur'ān and leading commentaries upon it; Muslim theology,

¹ Gio(vanni) Antonio Menavino, *Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi*, Florence, 1548. The edition here referred to is that of Florence 1551, which appeared under the title, *I costumi, et la vita de Turchi*, p. 91.

² Elias Habesci, *État actuel de l'empire ottoman . . . avec une description particulière de la cour et du Serral du Grand Seigneur* (1784), translated by M. Fontanelle, Paris, 1792, Vol. I, pp. 157-87.

jurisprudence, and law; and Turkish history, music, and mathematics. Of the last subject the only branch which is known with certainty to have been taught in the palace schools is arithmetic,³ although it seems likely that instruction may also have been given in geometry. The great Turkish architect of the sixteenth century, Sinān Bey, who as a member of the Outer Service of the Grand Seraglio was educated in one of the Janizary barracks in Constantinople, probably that in At Meydān, almost certainly received some instruction in geometry as preparation for his later work as an engineer, and the curriculum of the Palace School was in general much more comprehensive and advanced than that provided for the Janizaries. Of the general ignorance of "the sciences" on the part of the Turks Rycat writes:

For other Sciences, as Logick, Physick, Metaphysick, Mathematicks, and other our University Learning, they are wholly ignorant; unless in the latter, as far as Musick is a part of Mathematicks, whereof there is a school apart in the *Seraglio*. Only some that live in *Constantinople* have learned some certain rules of Astrology, which they exercise upon all occasions, and busie themselves in Prophetesies of future contingences of the Affairs of the Empire, and the unconstant estate of great Ministers, in which their predictions seldom divine grateful or pleasing stories. Neither have the wisest and most active Ministers or Souldiers amongst them, the least inspection into Geography, whereby to be acquainted with the situation of Countreys or disposition of the Globe, though they themselves enjoy the possession of so large a portion of the Universe. Their Sea-men, who seldom venture beyond sight of land (unless they be those of *Barbary*, who are *Renegadoes* and practised in the Christian Arts of Navigation) have certain *Sea-carts* ill-framed, and the capes and headlands so ill laid down, that in their Voyages from *Constantinople* to *Alexandria*, the richest place of their trade, they trust more to their eye and experience, then the direction of their maps; nor could I ever see any Cart of the black Sea made either by *Turk* or *Greek* which could give the least light to a knowing Seaman, so as to encourage him according to the rules of Art, to lay any confidence thereon in his navigation.⁴

³ *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 177; Albert Bobovi, *Serai enderum [sic] civé*, translated anonymously under the title *Memoires sur les Turcs*. Dated Constantinople, November 10, 1666. Count Paul Riant Collection, Harvard University MS. Ott. 3030.4 (the folios of this MS. are incompletely numbered). (Joseph Freiherr) von Hammer-(Purgstall), *Des osmanischen Reich Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung*, Vienna, 1815.

⁴ Sir Paul Rycat, *Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, third edition, London, 1670, p. 32. For the extent of the contribution of the Turks to the

Physical training was begun with gymnastic exercises, and from these progressed to sports of various kinds, cavalry exercises, and other "arts of war." As a result of the systematic and long-continued physical training which they received, the students of the Palace School are said to have developed remarkable strength and agility of body, vigorous health, and unusual skill in arms: to an extraordinary degree they were rendered "fit for the Wars and all active employments."⁵ The high standard of development which they attained may be judged from the fact that there was no finer army in Europe than the Turkish army during the centuries when the palace system of education was at the height of its efficiency, and that practically all the officers of the regular cavalry, or Cavalry of the Sublime Porte, and many of the officers of the Feudal Cavalry, had been trained in the Palace School.

In the *Traditions* the Prophet Muḥammad is reported to have said that "He who earns is a dearly beloved friend of Allāh" (Al-Kāsib habību-llāh). Perhaps as a result of this teaching—and perhaps not less as a provision against the inconstancy of fate in an oriental despotism—every Turk, no matter how high his station, was formerly accustomed to learn a craft or trade. Concerning the wide prevalence of this custom among the Turks Spandouino wrote in 1519: "There is not any prince or lord so great, even the Emperor himself, that he does not cause his children to be instructed in some art or science, by means of which he could earn a livelihood in case he should fall upon evil days."⁶ Some of the sultans excelled in their chosen crafts. Muḥammad II, who took unusual interest in gardens even for a Turk, was himself a skilled gardener and often worked with the spade, rake and other tools in the gardens of the Grand Seraglio⁷ or other royal palaces; "this same Muḥammad was also accustomed to fashion

geographical and nautical sciences, see von Hammer-Purgstall, *Histoire de l'empire ottoman*, Paris, 1835-41, Vol. VI, pp. 184 ff.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶ Théodore Spandouyn Cantacasin (Theodorus Spandounginos), *Petit traité de l'origine des Turcqs* (1519), edited by Charles Schefer, Paris, 1896, pp. 179-80.

⁷ Gio(vanni) Maria Angiolello, *Historia turchesca di Gio Maria Angiolello Schiavo et altri schiavi dall' anno 1429 sur al 1513*, Bibl. Nat. fonds. ital., 1238, fols. 48-50; Michel Baudier, *Histoire générale du serrail, et de*

rings for the bow, *cani* for the girdle, and sheaths for the sword, which things he did merely for passing the time.”⁸ His grandson and great-grandson, Selīm I and Suleimān I, were both skilled goldsmiths;⁹ Selīm II produced in large quantities the crescents which pilgrims were accustomed to mount upon the staffs which they carried to the Holy Cities; Murad III manufactured arrows and Aḥmed I the type of ivory ring which archers wore upon their thumbs, upon which he is said to have labored assiduously;¹⁰ and so on down to ‘Abd ul-Ḥamīd II, several specimens of whose fine Damascene inlaid work may be seen in the Mejīdiyyeh Kiūshk. The arts and crafts which were taught the pages in the four schools of vocational training of the Grand Seraglio were in each case determined by the lines of palace service to which these schools were attached, as the Treasury or the Commissariat, or else by the specific services which the pages performed for the sultan.

Above all it was the aim of the Turkish sultans to discover and to train youths of exceptional ability for leadership in the state. Of the unusual degree to which individual aptitude or talent was appreciated by the Turks Busbecq writes:

The Turks rejoice greatly when they find an exceptional man as though they had acquired a precious object, and they spare no labour or effort in cultivating him; especially if they discern that he is fit for war. Our plan [that is, in western Europe] is very different; for if we find a good dog, hawk, or horse, we are greatly delighted, and we spare nothing to bring it to the greatest perfection of its kind. But if a man happens to possess an extraordinary disposition, we do not take like pains; nor do we think that his education is especially our affair; and we receive much pleasure and many kinds of service from the well trained horse, dog, and hawk; but the Turks much more from a well educated man [ex homine bonis moribus informato] in proportion as the nature of a man is more admirable and more excellent than that of other animals.¹¹

la cour du Grand Seigneur, Empereur des Turcs, Paris, 1624, Preface, pp. 41-2.

⁸ Angiolello, *op. cit.*, fol. 49.

⁹ Evliya Efendi (Evliya Chelebi), *Narrative of Travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa in the Seventeenth Century*, translated from the Turkish by the Ritter Joseph von Hammer, London, 1834, Vol. I, pp. 2, 188.

¹⁰ Sandys, *Travales: Containing a History of the Original and Present State of the Turkish Empire*, London, 1658, p. 57.

¹¹ Busbecq, *Exclamatio: sive De re Militari contra Turcam instituenda*

The chief means employed to stimulate students to the maximum of effort were a large measure of freedom in the choice of subjects of study, and a system of merit consisting of carefully graded rewards and corresponding punishments. In the third quarter of the seventeenth century, Flachat observed that "the dispositions and inclinations of the pages were carefully consulted."¹² The course of study within broad lines was almost entirely a matter of choice, the only absolutely prescribed subjects being the Turkish language and the Qur'ān. In addition to the prescription of these particular subjects there existed only the one general requirement that a page "should work at something and should work in earnest, drones only not being permitted." In actual fact the pages are said to have devoted day and night to the study of the "sciences," using their recreation time for required physical exercises, or for study.¹³ To quote again from Flachat: "The pages apply themselves very seriously to study. They make it their duty to excel, as that is the only means which they have of attaining success. This ambition gives rise among them to a praiseworthy emulation."¹⁴

The system of merit of the Palace School, which was a replica of the carefully graded rewards underlying the hierarchy of the government, prevailed in the school from its first foundation until the final breaking-up of the ancient system of slave government. Busbecq's description of the workings of this system of merit in the government applies equally to its workings in the schools:

No distinction is attached to birth among the Turks; the deference to be paid a man is measured by the position he holds in the public service. There is no fighting for precedence; a man's place is marked out by the *consilium*, etc., in *Augerii Gislenii Busbequii Omnia quae extant*, Pest, 1758, pp. 234-77, 262-3, as quoted by Albert Howe Lybyer, *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 74.

¹² Jean-Claude Flachat, *Observations sur le commerce et sur les arts de l'Europe, de l'Asie, de l'Afrique, et même des Indes orientales* (1740-1758), Lyon, 1766, Vol. II, pp. 188 ff.

¹³ Evliya Efendi, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 132 ff.; 'Atā Tayar Zedeh Mehmed, *Tārīkhi 'Atā Constantinople A. H. 1291-93* (1874-1876).

¹⁴ Flachat, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 188 ff.

duties he discharges. In making his appointments the Sultan pays no regard to any pretensions on the score of wealth or rank, nor does he take into consideration recommendations or popularity; he considers each case on its own merits, and examines carefully into the character, ability, and disposition of the man whose promotion is in question. It is by merit that men rise in the service, a system which ensures that posts should be assigned only to the competent. Each man in Turkey carries in his own hand his ancestry and his position in life, which he may make or mar as he will. Those who receive the highest offices from the Sultan are for the most part the sons of shepherds or herdsmen, and so far as being ashamed of their parentage, they actually glory in it, and consider it a matter of boasting that they owe nothing to the accident of birth; for they do not believe that high qualities are either natural or hereditary, nor do they think that they can be handed down from father to son, but that they are partly the gift of God, and partly the result of good training, great industry, and unwearied zeal; arguing that high qualities do not descend from a father to his son or heir, any more than a talent for music, mathematics, and the like; and that the mind does not derive its origin from the father, so that the son should necessarily be like the father in character, but emanates from heaven, and is thence infused into the human body. Among the Turks, therefore, honors, high posts, and judgeships are the rewards of great ability and good service. If a man be dishonest, or lazy, or careless, he remains at the bottom of the ladder, an object of contempt; for such qualities there are no honors in Turkey!¹⁵

An additional incentive to merit was an allowance, or salary, on a differential scale, for the six halls of the Grand Seraglio and the three affiliated schools as shown in the accompanying table.

Promotions from one hall to another, appointments to student offices, and later to military and administrative positions, all were based strictly upon the merit system.

Punishments for failure in the performance of duty or for infringement of regulations were frequent and severe but at the same time were kept within distinct limits. Penalties for ordinary offenses were scolding, fasting, deprivation of the more popular physical exercises, especially boxing, running, and leaping; and also flogging with a long slender lash or stick on the soles of the feet, in an ordinary offense to the number of ten strokes (*falaqā*). It was expressly forbidden that either officers of the school or outside teachers should administer corporal punishment more than once in one day to the same pupil; anyone who exceeded this limit

¹⁵ Oqier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *Life and Letters*, translated by C. T. Forster and F. H. B. Daniell, London, 1881, Vol. I, pp. 154-5.

was dismissed from the school, or if the offense were flagrant, suffered the loss of one of his hands.¹⁶

Without question the training of the Palace School was arduous—austere and relentless. It was the opinion of Rycaut that

he who hath run through the several Schools, Orders and degrees of the Seraglio, must needs be an extraordinary mortified man, patient of all labours, services, and injunctions, which are imposed on him with a strictness beyond the discipline that religious novices are acquainted with in Monasteries, or the severity of *Capuchins*, or holy Votaries. But yet methinks these men that have been used all their lives to servitude, and subjection, should have their spirit abased, and when licensed from the Seraglio to places of Trust and Government, should be so acquainted how to obey, as to be ignorant how to Rule, and be dazzled with the light of liberty, and overjoyed with the sence of their present condition, and past sufferings, passing from one extreme to another, that they should lose their reasons, and forget themselves and others. But in answer hereunto, the Turks affirm, that none know so well how to govern, as those who have learned how to obey; though at first the sence of their freedom may distract them, yet afterwards the discipline, lectures, and morality in their younger years, will begin to operate, and recollect their scattered sences into their due and natural places.¹⁷

The military decline of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the consequent change in national policy, especially the increased importance of diplomacy as a weapon of defense, made itself felt less in the courses of study of the Palace School than in its code of behavior. The ideal page as described at the beginning of the nineteenth century reflects the fundamental change which had taken place in the methods of government:

A page must keep silent as the woodcutter Andreas in a Russian peasant's house, and comport himself in general as if honey were on his tongue and oil of almonds on his back. At times he must be blinder than a mole, deafer than a *mountain-coq* [woodcock—*auerhahn*], more insensible than a polypus; but again at other times he must have the eyes of a lynx and the ear of a Pomeranian wolf-dog. He must learn to turn his eyes always upon the ground and to keep his arms always crossed over his breast. In propor-

¹⁶ Menavino, *op. cit.*, p. 94; Bobovi, *op. cit.*; Blaise de Vigenère, *Illustrations de Blaise de Vigenère Bourbonnois sur l'histoire de Chalcondile, Athénien*, a continuation of Chalcondyles, *Histoire de la décadence de l'Empire grec à établissement de celui des Turcs . . . de la traduction de B(laise) de Vigenère Bourbonnois*, Rouen, 1660, p. 56; Ahmed Râsim, *Resimli ve Kharitali Osmanlı Tarikhi*, Constantinople, A.H. 1328 (1910); Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

¹⁷ Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

tion as he approaches manhood he must become more circumspect, inclined to make friends of all whom he meets and enemies of none, for even the meanest may often defeat one's ends. He must trust no one, but always suspect the worst, though feigning the contrary. . . . Mankind is as a rule wicked; self-interest is the mainspring of action, and virtue is mere hypocrisy.¹⁸

In spite of the transformation in ideal the curriculum suffered little outward, or formal, change during the three centuries and a half that the Palace School remained the military and political school of the Ottoman State.

Instruction in the liberal arts was begun in the preparatory period and continued throughout the course. Particular stress was put upon the study of the Turkish language, which students of the palace schools were required to speak, read, and write fluently and correctly—no small undertaking, even for a Turk. Three lists of the books in use in the school in the seventeenth century, which offer valuable evidence concerning the curriculum,¹⁹ include no Turkish grammars or books of syntax, a lack which suggests that there was no formal instruction along these lines. Turkish books which are included in the lists belong chiefly to a *genre* known as *Mulamma'*, narrative romances, or collections of short tales, characterized by a very ornate style with an unusually large admixture of Arabic and Persian words. It was a very popular form of literature with "the most airy and ingenious spirits" among the palace pages, and it is said that "the great difference between the speech of those who were educated in the Sarāy and of those educated outside, which was derived from the books which they read," probably resulted from the reading of this type of romance.²⁰ Several of the most popular were a translation of the *Arabian Nights* into Turkish; the *Sayyid Baṭṭāl* or *Baṭṭāl-i-Ghāzi*, an epic of the struggle of an Arab hero

¹⁸ H. von F. Murhard Reimers, et al., *Ansichten von Konstantinopel und dem Kaiserlichen Serail, Konstantinopel und St. Petersburg*, St. Petersburg, 1805-1806, Vol. II, pp. 145-6.

¹⁹ Bobovi, Harvard MS.; Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 32; Evliya Efendi, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 132-9.

²⁰ Ottaviano Bon, *Il Seraglio del gran signore* (1608), edited by G. Berchet, Venice, 1865, p. 36; Reimers, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 145 f.; see also Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 31, and Bobovi, *op. cit.*

against paganism in behalf of Islām, a story which enjoyed a perennial popularity among Turkish soldiers and Arabian peasants; the *History of Forty Vizirs* (*Qirq Wazır*), a compilation in prose of Turkish folk tales of different periods; and the *Story of Kalīla wa-Dimna* or the *Royal Book* (*Humāyūn Nāmah*), a book of fables translated from Indian sources into Pehlevi, then into Arabic, and from Arabic into Turkish in the reign of Murād III. All of these romances are still in circulation today, a remarkable testimony to the degree to which they were representative of the national spirit and ideals and to the wisdom of their selection. Twelve different styles of Turkish calligraphy were taught in the Palace School.²¹ Students who specialized in calligraphy usually aspired to secretarial positions in some one of the various lines of government service, or to the higher offices of government, such as that of Secretary of Foreign Affairs. No trace has been found in the Palace School curriculum of history other than Turkish history, and instruction in that appears to have been indirect rather than formal and systematized. It was, however, in the Palace School that the majority of the official chronologers were trained—the so-called palace historians (*sarāy vaqa'at-nuvis*), inaugurated by Muḥammad II and continued by his successors in almost unbroken sequence down to 'Abd al-Raḥmān Sherif Efendī in the present generation.

The Arabic and Persian languages and literatures have been well styled "the humanities of Islāmic culture." At the height of the influence of the Palace School a knowledge of Arabic as the key to the Qur'ān and other authoritative sources of the Holy Law (*Sherī'at*), was esteemed a "necessary accomplishment of a Pasha, or any great Minister in relation to the better discharge of his office, he being thereby enabled to have an inspection into the writings and sentences of the *Kadees*, or other officers of the law within his jurisdiction, as well as furnished with knowledge and matter of discourse concerning religion."²² From the first day of their matriculation students were taught the prescribed manner of saying the five daily prayers and of reciting the Qur'ān. During the course of one year they were drilled in the intricacies

²¹ Bobovi, *op. cit.*

²² Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

of the Arabic alphabet and thoroughly instructed in the principles of the grammar and syntax.

The Arabic grammars which were in use when Bobovi was a page in the Palace School were *Kitāb al-binā'*, *Kitāb al-Maqṣūd*, *Kitāb al-'Izzī* (cf. Pertsch's *Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Gotha Library*, No. 194, 2, d-c-b), and also *Marāḥ al-arwāḥ* (cf. Brockelmann, *Geschichte*, Vol. II, p. 21). These are on accident. On syntax the text-books were: the *Maṣbāḥ* of al-Muṭarrizī, the *Ajurrūmiya* of Ibn Ajurrūmī, the *Kāfiya* of Ibn al-Ḥāḥib with its commentary by the Persian poet Jāmī (cf. Brock., Vol. I, p. 304, No. 13; Vol. II, p. 207, No. 11). Their Arabic dictionaries were the *Lughat Akhtarī* of Musliḥ al-dīn Muṣṭafā al-Qaraḥiṣārī (Brock., Vol. II, p. 713, n. 430) and *Subḥa-i-sibyān* (the *Rosary of Children*), of which a MS. dated as late as A.H. 1256 exists in one of the Suleimāniya madrasas.

When a sufficient acquaintance with the Arabic language had been acquired, the student began the study of commentaries on the Qur'ān and of the traditions and of treatises on Muslim jurisprudence, theology, and law. The chief commentary on the Qur'ān was that of al-Baiḍāwī (*Enwār al-Tanzīl*), commonly called *Tefsīr Qādī*, while the collection of traditions studied included the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, the *Sunan* of Ibn Mājah and the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim. Among the treatises on theology and law those in most common use were the *Shurūṭ al-ṣalāt* and the *Sharī'a* of Sadr al-sharī'a (Brock., Vol. II, p. 214), the *Multaqā al-abḥūr* of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (Brock., Vol. II, p. 432), the *Muqaddima* of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Shaznawī (Brock., Vol. I, p. 378), the *Mukhtaṣar* of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Qudūrī (Brock., Vol. I, p. 174), and the *Hidāya* of Burhān al-dīn 'Alī al-Marghīnānī (Brock., Vol. I, p. 376). A student of the Palace School who specialized in the study of the Holy Law usually aspired to become an *imām* in one of the royal mosques, a position which insured a competency and was a life sinecure; a palace *juzkhān*, one who can recite a part of the Qur'ān for the repose of the soul of some one who had made legal provision for that purpose; or a *ḥāfiẓ*, a professional reciter of the Qur'ān, who can recite the entire book from memory. Those students who specialized in the

edicts of the sultans and other ordinances of civil law aimed at some charge of judicature.²³

The Persian language was the courtly language of the nearer Orient and the key to the literature of chivalry and romance. Rycaut summarizes the reasons for its study by the students of the Palace School as follows:

It fits them with quaint words and eloquence, becoming the Court of their Prince, and corrects the grossness, and enriches the barrenness of the *Turkish* tongue, which in itself is void both of expression and sweetness of accent. It teaches them also a handsome and gentle deportment, instructs them in Romances, raises their thoughts to aspire to the virtuous and generous actions they read of in the *Persian* novellaries, and endues them with a kind of *Platonick* love to each other, which is accompanied with a true friendship amongst some few, and with as much gallantry as is exercised in any part of the world.²⁴

Students of the Palace School were promoted to the study of Persian as soon as they had attained proficiency in Turkish and Arabic. No mention is made of the use of Persian grammars. The dictionary employed was that of Shāhiḍī (*cf.* Gibb, *History*, Vol. IV, p. 176, n. 3; pp. 257, 258, n. 2) which is written partly in prose and partly in verse. The books which were most commonly read were the *Book of Advice* (*Pend-Nāma*) by Ferīd al-dīn 'Aṭṭār; the *Gulistān* and the *Bustān* of Sa'dī and a fourth book with the title of *Danisten* which may be the *Dānish-nāma-i-'Alā'i*, of Avicenna (see Brock., Vol. I, p. 453, foot; and Browne, *Literary History of Persia*, Vol. II, p. 115). As exercises in composition students wrote poetry and translated books, with commentaries appended, in both Arabic and Persian.²⁵ Students who specialized in Persian usually had in view positions either as secretaries or as chancellors.²⁶

Turkish music received its first impulse from the Greek composer Caharias shortly after the conquest of Constantinople. Chiefly under the patronage of the sultans it continued to develop until it reached its culminating point under Selīm III and Maḥmūd II, who were themselves performers and composers of

²³ Bobovi, *op. cit.*; Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

²⁴ Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

²⁵ Habesci, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 177.

²⁶ Bobovi, *op. cit.*

some note. The description of the music of the Grand Seraglio given by Albert Bobovi, who according to his own statement was a "music-page" in the palace for nineteen years, is historically valuable not only as a detailed description of the palace music of the seventeenth century, but also as a reflection of Turkish music in general of the same period.²⁷ Although the First Musician of the palace (*Sāzendeḥ Bāshī*) during the reign of Murād IV (1623-1640) was a celebrated Italian musician, the Turks had no knowledge of the system of notation in vogue in Europe. The art of Turkish music is said to have consisted entirely of the melody and the touch of the performer and of the power to extemporize. Both chamber music and military music were taught in the Palace School. Chamber music consisted largely of vocal music. There were three types of Turkish songs: lyrical, philosophical, and folk songs. The "*chansons délicieux*," or lyric songs, of which there were four subdivisions, the *Murebba'*, *Kiār*, *Na't*, and *Semā'y*, were written for the most part in Persian and were the songs of the "erudite and civilized." The poet Vāṣuf 'Osmān Bey (ob. A.H. 1240), who was educated as a page in the Palace School, was one of the most famous composers of songs of this type. The second class were the "*chansons spirituels*," or philosophical songs, of which there were three subdivisions, the *Tesbīḥ*, *Ilāhī*, and *Tevḥīd*. The third class consisted of the folk songs, or songs of the common people, called *Turkī*, which treated of war, victory, love, suffering in the absence of a loved one, and other familiar emotions, and which bore a strong resemblance to the "*chansons du pont neuf*."

Instruments used to accompany the lyrical and philosophical songs were the *kemenchah*, a kind of little violin; the *santūr* or psaltery; the *miskal* or bagpipe; the *nāy* or flute;²⁸ the *nefir* or Persian bagpipe; the *'ūd* or lute; and the *ṭanbūr* or *sheshtār*, a little guitar with three strings and a very long arm having a large

²⁷ Bobovi, *op. cit.*

²⁸ Pietro della Valle, (*Viaggi descritti da lui medesimo in lettere familiari all' erudito suo amico Mario Schipano*, Venice, 1661-1663. The edition here referred to is the French translation, *Voyages en Turquie, Egypt, Palestine, Perse, Indes orientales, Chypre, et autres lieux*, Paris, 1745, Vol. I, pp. 87-8) mentions the *miskal* and the *nay* as being especially popular.

number of frets for marking the tones and semitones, which was played not with the fingers, but with a blade of tortoise shell, or with a quill. Instruments used to accompany folk songs were for the most part three-stringed, such as the *chaghāneh*, the *thschegour* (*sic*), *tanbūra*, and other simple instruments of the people. The length or brevity of the verse of a song invariably determined the time, of which there were twenty-four types in Turkish music. One verse, the measure and cadence of which strongly resemble the Alexandrian, but for which a masculine form of rhyme was invariably employed, was used especially for improvisation, a form of music always especially popular with Turks.

The instruments which were used for military music, with one exception, are said to have been intended for the pomp of a ceremony rather than for military exercises. These instruments were the *būrū*, or trumpet; the *dāvūl*, or ordinary drum, and a special variety of large bronze drum which, mounted upon a horse, was used to announce the approach of the sultan; the *nakkāreh*, consisting of several copper plates which were beaten one against the other; and the *kumdūm betcke* (*sic*), *dunbalek*, and *lil* (*sic*), all of which were varieties of timbals. It was the candid opinion of Bobovi that Turkish military music was no more than "a fracas, a great and disagreeable noise." On the other hand the Jewish page Habesci, while conceding that it was without doubt barbarous from the point of view of noise, was of the opinion that "it had enough of sweetness and harmony to make one like it."²⁹

The Conservatory of Music (*Meshq Khāneh*), which is said to have been especially well furnished and well adapted in every way to teaching purposes,³⁰ was not an independent unit like the other vocational schools of the Grand Seraglio, but a school for all the members of the student body. With the exception of a certain number of the masters of military music who were required by the nature of their duties to be constantly present in the palace and who were lodged in the Hall of the Expeditionary Force, the music masters were non-resident. During the forenoon the building was given over to chamber music, and in the afternoon to

²⁹ Habesci, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 178.

³⁰ *Tārīkhi 'Aṭā*.

military music. Pages who specialized in chamber music were trained in both solo and chorus parts. As palace musicians their duties do not appear to have been onerous; each Tuesday they gave a concert while the sultan's hair was being cut or other rites of his toilet performed. On rare occasions, blindfolded and closely guarded by black eunuchs, they gave concerts for the harem, the harem music as a rule being supplied by the young girl slaves and the black eunuchs.

From the time of Sultan 'Osmān the military band is reported to have played at the royal palace always at the time of the *Ikindi*, that is, the third prayer, which is said in the middle of the afternoon. Its other functions were to salute the sultan a half hour before dawn and one and a half hours after sunset, and to accompany him when he appeared in public; to sound the *reveillon* two hours before sunrise, and the curfew two hours after sunset, upon certain towers of the city; to announce the two Bayrāms; to serenade the embassies on their principal fête days; and to honor those pages who were graduated from the Palace School with the title of *pāshā* or *beylerbey*. In 1612 there are said to have been one hundred and fifty members of the military band.³¹ It is said in Constantinople that the orchestra which was organized shortly after the armistice of 1918 to accompany the cinema in St. Irene is the lineal descendant of the old military band of the Grand Seraglio.

As soon as the pages were of an age to endure strenuous physical exercise, no effort was spared to render them strong, agile, and courageous.³² Initial physical exercises were the lifting and carrying of heavy weights. The apparatus of the first exercise consisted of a pulley and cord fastened against a wall, with a bag attached to the end of the cord, which at first weighed from six to ten *ōqas* and was later increased to thirty-five, and even forty *ōqas*. A page drew the cord with his right hand while bracing his left against the wall. The second exercise was the lifting and carrying of various kinds of weights in the arms and upon the shoulders. The first weights were the heavy timbers used for firing the fur-

³¹ Vigenère, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

³² Habesci, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 174.

nace of the Bath of the Inner Palace, which the pages carried upon their shoulders. From time to time the size of these timbers and other weights was increased until pages in the upper halls were frequently able, it is said, to carry as much as three hundred and seventy or even three hundred and eighty *ōqus* for a distance of one hundred and fifty, or one hundred and sixty paces. Later iron weights of various kinds were substituted. It is said that the pages were able with one arm to lift weights which ranged from forty to one hundred pounds, and that those which they were able to raise above their heads were "almost unbelievably heavy." For the fifteen pages who stoked the bath furnace (who were almost certainly from the Great Hall) there was a special apparatus consisting of iron bars

fasten'd upon Great Cramp-Irons over the door that goes into the Baths, and the middlemost of the Three, as it is commonly reported, weighs a hundred *Okkas*, which amount to Three hundred and fifty pounds, Paris weight, an *Okka* weighing three pounds and a half, or thereabouts. There was heretofore one of these Ichoglans, of so prodigious strength, that the Grand Seigneur himself would have the satisfaction of seeing a tryal, whether he could with one hand lift up and turn about that Iron-bar; which he did to the great astonishment of the Prince, and presently after he entertain'd him with another demonstration of the strength of his Arm. Over those three Iron-bars, there hung two Head-pieces of Iron, whereof one was an inch in thickness, and the other about the eighth part of an inch. The same Ichoglan did, in the Grand Seigneur's presence, at one blow of a Battle-Axe, cut through the head-piece of an inch thick, and at one blow with a Sabre cleft the other to the middle of it.³³

Each year, during the festivities which accompanied the celebration of the first Bayrām, competitive tests in the lifting and carrying of weights were attended by the sultan and the entire personnel of the Palace School. In the course of the tests the military band played and the onlookers acclaimed their favorites with the cry of "Allāh, Allāh, give him strength." The winner received a purse of five hundred *écus* from the sultan and, in certain cases, was promoted to the Hall of the Treasury.

³³ Tavernier, *The Six Voyages . . . through Persia into Turkey and the East Indies, finished in the year 1670 . . . , together with a New Relation of the Present Grand Seigneur's Seraglio*, translated by J. P. [hillips], London, 1678, p. 41.

More advanced physical exercises were archery, wrestling, sword practice, and *chōmāq* (*cholik chōmāq*, a game played with a ball attached to a cord), and *jerīd* (javelin throwing, the players being on horseback). The magnificent quivers of the sultans, richly overlaid with diamonds, emeralds, and other precious stones, which form part of the present exhibition of the Treasury, offer convincing testimony of the high esteem in which archery was held by the Turks as a sport, even after it ceased to be important as a means of warfare. Murād IV, who performed prodigious feats with the bow and arrow, especially encouraged this sport. Pages of the Palace School received their first instruction with a bow strung with a chain. From practice bows of this type they were promoted to bows strung with sinew, the most advanced of which required very great strength and skill to draw. Yet even with the largest and heaviest of these bows the record of two hundred draws without stopping is said to have been not infrequently scored at the school matches and tournaments.

Several sultans, especially Sultan Ibrāhīm, greatly enjoyed wrestling as a spectacle and encouraged it among the school sports. The pages anointed their bodies with oil in the customary manner and wrestled nude, except for their *caleçons* (shorts). Before entering the arena, they invariably offered up a special prayer for wrestlers which ran as follows: "Allāh! Allāh! For the sake of the Lord of all created beings—for the sake of Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, for the sake of Muḥammad Bokhārī of Ṣārī Ṣāltīq,³⁴ for the sake of our Shāikh Muḥammad who laid hold of the garments and the limbs, let there be a setting-to of hand upon hand, back upon back, and breast upon breast! And for the love of 'Alī, the Lion of Allāh, grant assistance, O Allāh!" Another popular exercise was a kind of sword-and-buckler practice originally introduced from Poland. A page held in his left hand a pad shaped in the form of a shield, and in his right hand a scimitar with which he practised a driving blow calculated to sever the head of a sheep or the foot of a dead camel.

³⁴ Ṣārī Ṣāltīq. A dervish, reported to have been a companion of Hajī Bakṭāsh, who was renowned in legend as a slayer of dragons and giants. See F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, Vol. II, Chap. XXXII.

Since the majority of the students of the palace schools were destined for the cavalry service, one of the main objects of the physical training was fine horsemanship, a sport especially encouraged by Suleimān I. Not only did the pages become skilled cavalymen, but they also excelled in feats of horsemanship. While running their horses at full speed, they would unsaddle and resaddle them without slackening their pace; they would ride standing on the seat of the saddle; they would ride two horses at the same time with one foot on each saddle; two pages while riding at top speed would exchange horses with one another; and they would slide under the bellies of their horses and remount from the other side.

The game of *jerīd*, which was played in the Jerīd Field, a large exercise field situated on the Marmora side of the palace, near the place where once had stood the *Nea*, or New Church of Basil the Macedonian,³⁵ was a mock battle in which mounted horsemen threw wooden darts at each other. Although it attained its greatest popularity in the period between Muḥammad IV and Muṣṭafā II, it was a prominent feature of royal entertainment in the Hippodrome at least as early as the second half of the sixteenth century. In his state papers, William Harborne, ambassador from Queen Elizabeth to Murād III and first English ambassador to Turkey, has left an interesting description of a game which he witnessed in the month of July 1582:

On Monday 9 [July, 1582], after dinner there appeared in the Piazza, the King's falconer, the son of the said Achmet Bassa and many important gentlemen [pages], who skirmished together throwing darts against one another using one, two, three, and four at a time, they were mounted on most beautiful horses splendidly caparaisoned and changed them after every two or three courses, shewing themselves as dexterous and quick at throwing the dart and evading those of the enemy, that they were reputed to be brave knights which was done thus because of the presence of the King and the

³⁵ Ernest Mamboury, *Constantinople, Tourist Guide*, Galata, 1925, p. 406; Karl Wulzinger, *Baudenkmäler zu Konstantinopel*, Hanover, 1925, p. 5. Melling's map of Seraglio Point shows the "Place et Batiment du Dgird," and that of 'Abd al-Raḥmān Sherīf Efendī, the Target Stones and Target Positions for archery practice in the same field; see Antoine-Ignace Melling, *Voyage pittoresque de Constantinople et des rives du Bosphore*, Paris, 1807-1824, and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Sherīf Efendī, *Top Qapu Sarayı Humayunı, Tarikhi Osmanı Enjumeni Mejmū'ası*, No. VI.

Sultans. The Son of the Governes (*ana*) of the Sultana Mother, much loved and favored by her also taking part. . . . Tuesday the 10th, there were no more than 80 horses, beautifully caparaioned who began skirmishing at midday, and continued till the evening throwing darts in the Roman fashion as was done yesterday but with greater show of wounding one another, those of yesterday being persons of quality having restrained themselves. When night came the usual fireworks were displayed in the presence of the Signore, the Mother, the son, the wife, and the Sultanas. Wednesday close on a thousand persons paraded round and round the hippodrome with the braying of drums, lutes, flutes, and other instruments in use among them, making a great noise, and one may say singing with great discordance, and after going round the Hippodrome two by two, they left. Then came the Signore wrestlers who naked gave very fine trials of strength and dexterity, each endeavoring to overcome the other, to obtain the victory, there was a prize bestowed by B of thousand aspres. Then having left there appeared certain spahi on horse-back, who skirmished with darts, which took up the rest of the time. . . . Wednesday the twelfth the morning passed quickly but after dinner a hundred horse appeared and performed in divers ways, besides tilting with darts. . . . On the following days till the 18th nothing further happened, but at the twenty-fourth hour, the same horse appeared to skirmish and wound each other with darts till evening, when the usual fireworks were displayed for five or six hours continuously.³⁶

It is said that Muḥammad IV delighted so much in the game that "every one in hopes of preferment, and in emulation one of the other, endeavoured to be a Master in it, and most are become so dexterous, that they will dart a stick of above three-quarters of a yard long with that force, that where it hits, it will endanger breaking a bone. The Grand Signore every day passes his time with seeing his pages exercised in this sport, in which ordinarily one knocks another from his Horse, and seldom a day passed in which some receive not bruises or desperate wounds. This Sultan doth many times appoint days of combat between the Black Eunuchs and some of his White Pages on Horseback, in this manner with the Gerit; and then happens such a skirmish with such emulation, each side contending for the honor of his color, race and dignity, with that heat and courage, as if they contended for the Empire; this pastime seldom concluding without some blood."³⁷

During the first years of the reign of Maḥmūd II the game was still played by the pages "during Bayrām and at every other possible opportunity, although everyone, old and young, knew that it no longer served the purpose of training for war, and that it

³⁶ William Harborne, *Public Records Office: State Papers, Foreign: Turkey*, Vol. I, entry July 25, 1582.

³⁷ Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

was a dangerous game. But because it once had been considered so fine a game, no one dared to say a word against it." Maḥmūd II abolished it at the same time that he abolished the Janizary Corps, "an action which sorely discontented the black eunuchs, who were great advocates of it because it was so good a show."³⁸


Of the introduction of vocational training into the curriculum of the Palace School at the end of the preparatory period, Rycaut says: "To the former lessons of school learning and exercise abroad, are added some other accomplishments of a Trade, handy-craft, or Mystery."³⁹ The pages of each of the four schools of vocational training specialized in the particular vocation of that school. The pages of the Hall of the Expeditionary Force, who constituted the military band of the palace and, oddly enough, also laundered the sultan's linen when he was on campaign or travelling, received special training in music and in the art of laundering; those of the Hall of the Commissariat were taught to prepare the royal drinks and specifics which were prepared in the Privy Commissariat, and were the actual cup-bearers to the sultan; those of the Hall of the Treasury were charged with set duties in connection with the Imperial Treasury and its contents; while those of the Hall of the Royal Bedchamber performed the offices of the Royal Bedchamber and were also entrusted with the care of the Holy Relics. Additional vocations in which large numbers of pages were instructed were falconry and attendance upon the bath. Pages to the number of seventy or eighty, of whom the twelve senior ones were drawn from the Hall of the Treasury and the remainder from the Hall of the Commissariat, were trained to accompany the sultan upon his hunting expeditions. Forty pages, taken from different halls at different periods, were attached to the Bath of the Palace School, twenty-five as attendants within the bath (*dellāklar*), and fifteen as stokers of the bath furnace (*kūlkhanjiler*), four of the stokers remaining always on duty in a chamber adjoining the furnace. Besides this common bath, each of the halls had a separate bath, with shifts of pages from the hall in attendance upon it. Twice each day the First

³⁸ Hāfız Eliās Bey, *Letai' fi Enderun*, Constantinople, 1859, pp. 389-90.

³⁹ Rycaut, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

WILLIAM M. RANDALL
*Professor of Library Science, Graduate Library
School, The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois*

THREE ENGRAVED STONES FROM THE
MORITZ COLLECTION AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



Published by courtesy of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

THREE ENGRAVED STONES FROM THE MORITZ COLLECTION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

By WILLIAM M. RANDALL

THE three stones considered in this article were acquired by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, along with the remainder of the collection of Mr. Bernard Moritz, in 1929. Their provenance is Egypt, in which country Dr. Moritz spent some years after 1896 as the Director of the National Library.

The first of these stones evidently dates from the Khalifate of Hārūn; the second is dated in the second century A.H., and Dr. Moritz believes the third to be contemporary with the second.

The first of these stones (No. 13706) is certainly not a grave-stone. It is probably a boundary stone. The writing is practically obliterated at certain points, and the stone is broken off at the bottom, in such a way that it is impossible to be certain how much of the text is missing.

So far as is determined, the reading is as follows:

بسم الله الرحمن
الرحيم * * * من الله
لعباده * * * ما امر
عبد الله هرون ا
ه مير المومنين اطال
الله بقاء عبادة له
من ارض كورة ا
سفل اشمون على يدي
عبد الجبار بن * * *
ا ح عامل الامير ا
لخصيب بن عبد * * *
* * * الله * * *

The translation of this is somewhat as follows:

In the name of Allāh, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

. . . from Allāh to His creatures . . .

This is what the creature of Allāh, Hārūn,
the Commander of the Believers, has commanded,
May Allāh lengthen his existence!


A mark [?] to him, from the land of Kūrah,
the lower part of Ushmūn, by the hands of
'Abd al-Jabbār bin . . . the Agent of the
Amīr al-Khaṣīb bin 'Abd [al-Ḥamīd]¹

May Allāh prosper . . .

The second of these two stones (No. 13707) is the longest of the three. It is engraved upon marble, and comes from the region about Assuan. The reading appears to be as follows:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
هَذَا مَا شَهِدَ بِهِ اِبْرَاهِيْمُ بْنُ اِسْحَقَ
شَهِدَ اَنْ اِلَهَ لَا اِلَهَ اِلَّا هُوَ وَحْدَ
ه لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ وَاِنْ مُحَمَّدٌ عَبْدُهُ
وَرَسُولُهُ اَرْسَلَهُ بِاَنْهَدَى وَدَيْنِ الْحَقِّ
لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ
الْمُشْرِكُونَ وَيَشْهَدُ اَنْ الْجَنَّةَ حَقٌّ
وَاَنْ النَّارَ حَقٌّ وَاَنْ اِلَـ[مُوتَ] حَقٌّ وَاَنْ الْبَعْثَ
حَقٌّ وَاَنْ السَّـ[اعَةَ اَتِي]ةٌ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهَا
١٠ وَاَنْ اِلَهَ سِيَامِرٍ فِي الْقُبُورِ عَلَى
تَحْيَى وَعَلَى ذَلِكَ يَمُوتُ حَيًّا اِنْ شَاءَ اِلَهُ
تَوَفَّى اِبْرَاهِيْمُ بْنُ اِسْحَقَ يَوْمَ السَّبْتِ
لِسِتَّةِ اَعْشَرَ يَوْمَ مَضَى مِنْ شَوَّالٍ مِنْ
سَنَةِ سَبْعٍ وَعَشْرِينَ وَمِائَةٍ وَرَحِمَ بِهِ
١٥ اِلَهُ وَغَفَرَ لَهُ وَرَضَى عَنْهُ وَرَحِمَ مِنْ
رَحِمَ عَلَيْهِ وَصَلَّى اِلَهُ عَلَى مُحَمَّدٍ
وَعَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ وَكُتِبَ * * *

¹ See the references to al-Khaṣīb in Lane's *Nights*. For al-Ushmūn see AL-ASHMUNAIN in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. I, pp. 484 f.



Published by courtesy of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

This is certainly a tombstone. The translation is fairly clear. It seems to be about as follows:

In the name of Allāh, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

This is what Ibrāhīm bin Ishāq testifies:

He testifies that there is no god but Allāh only, who has no associate,

and that Muḥammad is his creature and his messenger;

"He sent him with right guidance and the true religion, to render it victorious over every religion, even though the polytheists disapprove."²

He testifies that the Garden is real and that

the Fire is real and that Death is real and that the Resurrection is real

and "that the Hour is coming concerning which there is no doubt,"³

and that Allāh will give command with regard to a salutation of Life in the

grave, and on that he dies, although remaining alive, if it be the will of Allāh.

Ibrāhīm bin Ishāq died on Saturday the sixteenth day of Shawwāl

of the year 127. May Allāh be merciful to him and forgive him and be pleased

with him and show mercy to any who ask mercy for him.

The mercy

of Allāh be upon Muḥammad, and upon him be peace! Written . . .

The third of these stones, also on marble, is written in Kūfic. Like the second, it is from the region of Assuan. The reading is as follows:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
ان اعظم المصائب
مصيبة النبي صلى الله عليه
وسلم وشهد اسحق بن

² Qur. ix: 33.

³ Qur. xxii: 7.

٥ المبارك النجار انه الله
 والواحد الصمد لم يلد
 ولم يولد ولم يكن له كفوا
 احد على ذلك نحى وعليه
 نموت وعليه نبعث ان شا
 ١٠ الله اللهم اغفر له ذنبه
 ونور له قبره ولفه بجنة
 امين رب العلمين

This, like the second stone, appears to be a gravestone. The meaning is as follows:

In the name of Allāh, the Compassionate, the Merciful. Verily, the greatest of misfortunes is the misfortune of the Prophet,⁴ may Allāh have mercy on him and give him peace! Ishāq bin al-Mubārak al-Najjār testifies: Verily, the fact is, Allāh is the One, the Eternal. He did not beget and was not begotten, and there is no one like Him.⁵ According to this we live and according to this we die, and according to this we will be resurrected, if Allāh will. O Allāh, forgive him his sins, and lighten for him his grave, and join him to a Garden! Amen! Lord of the worlds!

It is evident that the most important of these stones is the first, since it mentions the name of Hārūn. The historical episode and the writer alike are obscure and might repay further study.

⁴ cf. the traditions in *Ibn Saad. Biographien Muhammeds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht*. Hsg. von Eduard Sachau (Leiden, 1904 ff.), Vol. II, Part II, p. 59.

⁵ cf. Qur. cxii.

GEORGE SARTON

*Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington,
Washington, D.C.; Editor of Isis*

REMARKS ON THE STUDY AND THE
TEACHING OF ARABIC

REMARKS ON THE STUDY AND THE TEACHING OF ARABIC

By GEORGE SARTON

WHEN I was invited to contribute a paper to the "Festschrift" edited to celebrate the jubilee of our beloved teacher, Dr. Duncan B. Macdonald, it occurred to me that no subject would be more fitting than the one to which a great part of his own life has been and is so generously devoted. Moreover that flattering invitation reached me at a time when I was preparing to leave my quiet study in the American University of Beirut and to roam in the Near East far away from libraries and with but very few books of my own. This precluded the selection of any technical subject and obliged me on the contrary to choose a very general one. It occurred to me that the best that I could do under the circumstances was to ventilate my views on the study of Arabic and its teaching.

I can hardly expect western teachers of Arabic to accept these views without opposition, but I shall be glad if they will kindly consider them, and I believe they deserve to be considered, for I have ruminated them for a considerable time and have had many occasions of discussing them not only with orientalists but also with all kinds of Arabic-speaking people of the East and of the West.

In particular I have frequently discussed them with Dr. Macdonald himself and since my arrival in the East I have written long Arabic letters to him to explain them. I know that he does not completely share them, and yet his own life experience might be adduced to illustrate them, for did he not spend a year in Egypt to obtain the living contacts which I advocate? The importance of that Eastern "Wanderjahr" none of his students will ever forget, for he often refers to it in his lectures, in his more intimate letters and in his conversation. In that respect my views might be considered an extension of his own, and if my enthusiasm

carries me too far I know he will be the first to excuse and forgive me.

In my *Introduction to the History of Science* I have proved the great importance of Arabic studies for the understanding of medieval thought. Indeed for the period extending from the middle of the eighth century to the end of the eleventh, the Arabic language was the main vehicle of progress and of culture. Even as today any Arabic-speaking man who wishes to pursue scientific investigations is obliged first of all to obtain a sufficient knowledge of one of the leading western languages, even so during those centuries, the shortest road to up-to-date information in any scientific field was the study of Arabic. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Arabic language lost its monopoly, yet it remained extremely important. In fact Christians and Jews recognized its supremacy more willingly at the very time when it was beginning to wane. An interesting example of the prestige of the Arabic language is given to us by the translation of the *Almagest*. By a curious accident that great work was first translated into Latin directly from the Greek. That direct translation was made in Sicily about the year 1160; however, it was completely eclipsed by another translation made somewhat later from the Arabic by Gerard of Cremona (Toledo, 1175). By the way, the very name of that great classic of ancient astronomy is a good symbol of the Greco-Arabic culture of the Middle Ages: for it is neither Greek nor Arabic but the Arabic transformation of a Greek word.

If it is expedient for medievalists or at any rate for some of them to know Arabic, this means that many more scholars will have to study that language than have done so before, hence it is worth while to consider the best methods of studying and teaching it.

1. *First principles.* The reading knowledge of a language is but a very imperfect and insufficient knowledge of it, however good and deep it may seem to be (and by the way it is very easy to fool oneself on the subject). One cannot have a very accurate knowledge of a language which one does not write, nor a fluent one of a language which one does not speak.

The spoken language is the real thing, and the written one but an image of it. A man must learn a language not only with his

eyes but with his ears. He does not begin to know it until he is able to speak and write it, and it is impossible to speak and write it readily unless he thinks in it.

Certain languages have long ceased to be used and one does not know how they were spoken, or even how individual words were pronounced. In such cases one must be satisfied with whatever knowledge is available, however imperfect it be. However, the Arabic language is a living language which is spoken and written to this day by many millions of people scattered over a considerable part of the world. A living language should be known not only passively but actively, in a functional and living way. A dead knowledge of a live thing is a falsification of it.

2. The best if not the only way to learn how to speak and write Arabic is to study it with educated people who speak and write it naturally. That is, one must learn the spoken language of today, or more correctly one of the forms of it, the dialect (or *dārij*) of this or that country. A western student may perhaps insist in the beginning on speaking classical Arabic (or what he fondly imagines is classical Arabic!) but he will find nobody to speak it with him in a natural way; he might as well insist on speaking Elizabethan English. It cannot be done, at least not naturally.

My comparison with the English language might be extended. Consider the case of a foreign scholar whose ambition is to study Shakespeare in the original. Would not the best method be first to study modern English? I can appreciate the full weight of that comparison because I was myself a victim of the opposite system. We were trained (in Belgium) to read Shakespeare when our grasp of the living language was still deplorably inadequate, the natural result being that we failed to know anything well. The foreign scholars who claim that they understand Shakespeare "better than the English," yet are unable to speak or write English properly, are ludicrous enough, but not more so than the orientlists who make similar claims with regard to Arabic yet are even less able to have any inside knowledge or intuitive understanding of it.

3. Moreover the study of *dārij* is important in other respects—from the theoretical or philological point of view as well as from

the utilitarian one—because the *dārij* has always been, is, and will ever be the womb of the language. Arabic is a living language and must be studied as such, but this cannot be done except by approaching it from the living, that is, from the *dārij*, side.

The opposite tendency is the rule in western countries, because the vast majority of Semitic scholars approach the Semitic field from the Hebrew side, and learn Arabic only after having obtained some knowledge of ancient Hebrew. To be sure it is better for an Arabist to know Hebrew and Syriac—but it would be better still for him to know Arabic! To be sure it is very interesting to approach Arabic studies from the Hebrew and Syriac point of view; but if one's purpose is really to know not comparative Semitic philology, but the Arabic language itself, it is much better to approach that language from the *dārij* angle: to approach it not from the dead past but from the living present.

The prejudices which dominate the teaching of Arabic are not different from those which obtain in other fields, e.g. classical, Romance or Germanic philology. In every case they are due to the tyranny of pedagogues out of touch with reality. For example, they will insist on the necessity for French teachers to know Latin, and no doubt it is better for them to know Latin, but is it not better still to know French? I have met French teachers in America who knew Latin and Old French exceedingly well (at least they enjoyed that reputation) but who had no fluent and idiomatic knowledge of the living French of today. On the other hand there are many teachers who do not know Latin or Romance philology but who know French very well. And is it necessary to recall that some of the greatest French writers, some of the very creators of the French language, never knew any language but their own? Whom should we choose as our teachers and follow as our guides, those who know best the thing to be taught or those who know best something else?

Arabic should be studied in the same way that Jewish scholars study Hebrew. And is not the latter's success the best proof of my assertions? For many Jewish scholars attain a knowledge of Hebrew which seems to be beyond the reach of Christian scholars, except perhaps a very few. The teaching of Hebrew in Christian seminaries is generally a complete failure, and no wonder, for in

many cases the teacher himself does not know that language except in a lifeless and pedantic way.

The teacher of Arabic should know Arabic first of all, and he should know it in an active and living way. Should he know Hebrew and Syriac as well, so much the better, but that is far less essential than a knowledge of *dārij*. It would be very useful for him also to have some familiarity with modern Hebrew, for the problems which the modern Hebrew philologists have to solve throw some light upon the similar problems raised by the constant growth of the Arabic language and its adaptation to modern needs.

4. There is a tendency among western orientalists to despise the *dārij* and to declare that it is too remote from the classical language and even from any written language to be of any use to the historian. This view is due to various misunderstandings. To begin with there are many kinds of *dārij*, corresponding to different times, places and social classes. Among the variety of dialects spoken in our time in a given area, we have in mind only the one used by educated people who not only speak but read and write beautifully: that dialect comes very close to the language used in the best newspapers. Even so when we claim that a German student of Shakespeare should know the living English of today, we have in mind not the rudimentary language spoken by illiterate cockneys or peasants, but the rich and elegant one spoken by well bred people.

5. In the second place, however different the *dārij* may be from the classical language, it is closely related to it—even as the growing parts of a tree are related to the other parts. The *dārij* is the living extension as well as it was the living substratum of classical Arabic. Some knowledge of it is absolutely indispensable for the understanding of the genius of that language. If one is sufficiently familiar with it many difficulties of the written language tend to disappear, for one learns to do intuitively and easily that which is hopelessly complicated if one has no other guides than grammatical rules. For example, the broken plurals are very annoying stumbling blocks to western orientalists and it is very difficult indeed to obtain a ready knowledge of them in a bookish manner. The only way to master them is to learn them intuitively. If one

hears continually the words *sūq*, *aswāq*, one ends by feeling that the plurals of such a word as *sūq* must be *aswāq*, not because the grammar and the dictionary say so, but because it *is* so. As our familiarity with the living language increases, the strength of such intuitive feeling increases along with our confidence in it. This is well illustrated by the creation of plurals for the many new words introduced from other languages into modern Arabic.¹ These plurals are not created by grammarians but by the common people, instinctively and casually. The soundness of the linguistic instinct is proved by the fact that these plurals are generally accepted without disagreement.

6. The differences between the Arabic dialects of different countries have been much exaggerated by foreign scholars and grammarians. These differences exist to be sure and they are very numerous yet very often they are but different alternatives equally consistent with the genius of the language. A Syrian listening to an Egyptian (or vice versa) is often surprised or amused by expressions which he would never think of using himself but which he has no difficulty in understanding. The phonetic changes give him even less trouble, because they are consistent. Once a Syrian has been told that the Egyptians pronounce the letter *jīm* like a hard *g* he easily makes the necessary allowance for that and after a short while adjusts himself to it without further ado.² In the same way we have no real trouble in understanding a person who lisps or drawls, even if we have not been warned.

At the American University of Beirūt, where I spent some of the happiest months of my life, there are a large number of students coming from Egypt and from every part of Arabic Asia. These students speak many different dialects, yet they experience no serious difficulty in understanding their Syrian instructors or in understanding one another. Egyptian actors travel abroad (even

¹ Thus the plurals of the Anglo-Arabic words *bank* and *book* are *bunūk* and *abwāk*. The words *book*, *abwāk* are used in Aden with the meaning of account books. The words *bank*, *bunūk* may be read every day in the Syrian and Egyptian newspapers.

² The Syrian and Egyptian dialects can be easily compared by means of such a book as the *English-Arabic Conversational Dictionary*, published by Richard Jaschke (384 p., London, n.d.), wherein both dialects are printed in parallel columns.

in the Maghrib) and play before audiences using other dialects than their own: do you think that this would be commercially possible if those audiences failed to understand them? I attended an Arabic comedy played in Beirūt by Egyptian actors. I had some difficulty in following them because my own Arabic is insufficient, but the audience—a popular one—had no difficulty whatever, judging by their laughter and applause.

The differences between eastern and western Arabic are of course deeper in every way. The western grammar has many peculiarities of its own and the western dialects include a number of Berber words. These words are absolutely enigmatic³ to eastern Arabs, but barring them any intelligent man can bridge the difficulties separating the eastern and western dialects much more easily than one would imagine.

Again, this is not an idle assertion on my part, for I can readily prove its truth. The French use many Maugrabin troops to hold their Syrian mandate. These soldiers, or at any rate the most intelligent of them, have no great difficulty in communicating with the native Syrians. A Syrian girl who knew but little French went to consult a French veterinary surgeon for her cat. She told me that she would have failed to explain her case but for the help of the surgeon's orderly, a Maugrabin soldier, who acted as interpreter. The French admiral in Beirūt travelled extensively across the Syrian territories administered by France; he told me that his Maugrabin chauffeur was always able to obtain all the necessary information from the inhabitants. These examples are especially interesting because they deal with uneducated people, or at any rate with people whose literary culture is at best elementary.⁴

7. In general we may say that the obstacles to the mutual understanding of people using different dialects decrease in pro-

³ As opposed to the *Arabic* words of other dialects whose new meaning is generally explained by the context. In the same way, an American does not need any explanation to understand the word "lift" for an elevator, while the corresponding term, say, in German, might puzzle him.

⁴ Since writing the above I have had opportunities of obtaining some knowledge of western dialects both in Tlemcen and in Fez. The lexicographical differences are even smaller, and the borrowed Berber words fewer in number, than I had anticipated.

portion to their literary culture, and they tend to vanish altogether in the case of Muslims who are well educated and who know the great Islāmic world.

On the other hand these obstacles are considerably magnified and are almost insuperable for two classes of people.

In the first place, the illiterate men and women whose own language is very rudimentary. This is especially true of non-Muslims, for the Muslims would have a common linguistic bond—however small—in the Qur'ān and the prayers.

In the second place, the western orientalists who have not taken the trouble to study any kind of *dārīj*. It is these orientalists who are chiefly responsible for the common account of Arabic dialects according to which the discrepancies between dialects and the classical language, and also the differences between individual dialects are exaggerated to the point of falsity.

One cannot emphasize too strongly that the differences between the eastern dialects at least are not greater than those which obtained between the French dialects (or the German or English dialects) before the nineteenth century.

8. Here again the comparison with the English language is very helpful. For anyone who approaches that language from the outside, the differences between the literary English and the poorer kind of newspaper English, as well as the differences between the written and the spoken languages, bulk so large that they frighten him. He is almost forced to the conclusion that he will have to master not one language but at least two. (This is exactly the state of mind of the western Arabist after his first distressing contacts with *dārīj*.) But in proportion as his knowledge increases and tends to become more organic and intuitive, the differences become negligible and he almost ceases to be conscious of them. In general we may say that foreigners (in the case of Arabic, the western orientalists) have a tendency to magnify linguistic discrepancies out of proportion to realities, because they are themselves unable to explain and reconcile them, and because of the imperfection and artificiality of their own knowledge. For example, French and German scholars criticize very strongly the American departures from English usage, not so much in a spirit of idle criticism, but because they are more pain-

fully conscious of those differences than the English-speaking people can possibly be, and are more often puzzled by them.

9. In a similar way a good part of the paleographical theories constructed by western pedants is due not to any intrinsic and vital need but to their own ignorance of the language. If their knowledge were more natural and more fluent they would hardly pay any attention to those peculiarities which loom so large in their eyes; at any rate they would not bother to analyze them. Paleographical difficulties hardly exist for those who know the language well enough. For him whose knowledge is (or has become) natural and intuitive, paleography is unnecessary beyond acquaintanceship with a number of symbols and abbreviations (many of which would be readily guessed anyhow).

Much of the time devoted by western scholars to paleography should be devoted to the language itself, the living language: if they did this they would not have to think any more of paleographical difficulties because these difficulties would vanish.

10. We may now pass to the consideration of practical problems. I shall keep especially in mind the American conditions, but my remarks would apply equally well *mutatis mutandis* to other countries. It is also clear that what I say of the study and teaching of Arabic might easily be applied to the study and teaching of other oriental languages.

11. Western teachers of Arabic should have a fluent and living knowledge of that language. They should be able to speak and write it readily. In order to achieve that purpose, after having obtained the usual proficiency in bookish Arabic (which is but too often considered the *nec plus ultra*) they should live at least two or three years in the Near East. After the first semester they should try to spend most of their time in a purely Arabic environment, boarding with people speaking good Arabic and no other language. It would be useful for them to have some knowledge of Hebrew (ancient and modern) and Syriac and perhaps of other Semitic languages—but as far as the teaching of Arabic is concerned, this would be a kind of luxury. On the contrary a deep familiarity with one kind of *dārij* would be an essential necessity, for everything else would hinge on that.

12. It would be extremely desirable if all American Arabists knew the same kind of *dārij*, as this would simplify matters and would make team work more easy especially when teachers or students moved from one Arabic department to another.

Which kind should be selected as the normal Arabic *dārij*? Opinions on the subject would vary considerably, each scholar being somewhat influenced by his own training and his pleasant reminiscences of this or that oriental country.

It is probable, however, that most would agree in excluding the western dialects which introduce unnecessary Berber complications.⁵

The more adventurous scholars might be tempted to collect their knowledge from the lips of the Bedouins of Arabia, and thus to follow illustrious examples. However, though that choice would be a good one from a purely philological point of view, it would hardly be commendable for the study of the living language of today which is fast developing not in the desert but in the cities in the stimulating neighborhood of newspapers, printing presses, and societies of every kind. The choice would then be restricted to the three main eastern dialects: the Egyptian, the Syrian, and the 'Irāqian, which represent the main intellectual centers of Eastern Islām: Cairo, Damascus, and Baghdād.

It would be impossible to prove the absolute superiority of any one of these dialects to the satisfaction of all concerned, if only because there is no such thing as absolute superiority in the matter of languages. One of them may be more successful or more popular than the others, and if sufficiently successful its very weaknesses may become canonic. Our choice must thus be determined by extrinsic rather than intrinsic reasons.

I think there is very much to recommend the Syrian dialects to the American public. These dialects are spoken in Syria and in the Holy Land not only by Muslims but by a large body of Christians. One can observe in Syria almost every modality of eastern Christendom; the whole country is like a living museum

⁵ Of course scholars engaged in special investigations concerning North Africa should know the western dialects and Berber, but we are here considering the needs of Arabic teaching in general.

of religions; there is an abundance of monuments which commemorate the Crusades; the Holy Land is one of the cradles of our noblest thoughts. There are many American organizations, large and small, all over Syria, and on the other hand a great many Syrians are established in the United States or have spent a part of their lives there. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that almost every Syrian family has some friends or relatives in the New World.⁶

Moreover, Syria is one of the loveliest countries on the face of the earth. Nowhere have I seen such a glorious combination of mountain and sea. In Beirût and along the ancient Phoenician coast one can see at one and the same time the blue Mediterranean and the snowy summits of the Lebanon chain. Wherever one goes the glory of nature is, so to say, magnified by abundant vestiges of the human past, for most of the great civilizations of ancient and medieval times are represented along those shores: Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Hittite, Phoenician, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Hellenistic, Nabataean, Palmyrean, Arabic, Byzantine, Frankish, Turkish, Armenian, etc.

Last but not least, life in Syria is very simple and cheap, much cheaper than in Egypt, 'Irâq, or Palestine, and by judicious changes of altitude one can find a pleasant climate all the year round.

13. Students of Syrian Arabic would find excellent working conditions at the American University of Beirût. There, they would be brought into close touch with educated Syrians, most of them Christians, but some of them Muslims, Druses, Jews, or Bahais. They would find excellent instructors, who know Arabic as their mother tongue yet have had sufficient western training and contacts to appreciate the special difficulties of western orientalists.

⁶ According to the returns of the Fifteenth Decennial Census, taken as of April 1, 1930, there were in the United States 148,022 white persons of Syrian or Palestinian origin, of whom 63,362 were actually born in those countries, and 67,830 white persons reported their mother tongue as Arabic. Hence practically all the Arabic-speaking people in the United States come from those countries. Their number is impressive.

Another excellent center of Arabic study and research exists at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I assume that Christians would be more tempted to go to Beirūt and Jews to the Holy City, but this is not by any means an absolute separation. Jewish scholars would be equally welcome in Beirūt, and Christian ones in Jerusalem. For those who could only spend the summer in the Near East and who would prefer the amenities of city life to those of the Lebanon, Jerusalem would be a better choice. Jerusalem would commend itself more strongly also to those who would study modern Hebrew as well as modern Arabic, but it would hardly be possible (as I discovered) to study both languages at once unless one already had a very deep and fluent knowledge of one of them.

I received a very warm welcome in both universities, but spent most of my time in Beirūt, or rather in Rās Beirūt, the western end of the city where the American University has established itself in a magnificent park overlooking sea and mountain. If it were possible for me to spend two or three years in the Near East, I would stay in Jerusalem during the summer and in Rās Beirūt throughout the rest of the year. Though there are differences between the Palestinian and the Lebanese Arabic these differences are more stimulating than annoying.

14. However well the western professors knew their Arabic (and I assume that each of them would have spent at the very least two years in Syria) it would still be necessary for them to be assisted by Syrian instructors and if possible to return periodically to Syria for a few months of fresh study. The need of native assistants has been realized in many schools of oriental languages, for example in the *Ecole des langues orientales vivantes* of Paris and in the *School of Oriental Studies* of London.

The Syrian assistants would be equally needed by the professors and by the students. The former would need them to keep their own knowledge as fresh and pure as possible. The latter would need their services for long and frequent drills in all kinds of phonetic, calligraphic, and literary exercises.

When I speak of Syrian assistants I do not mean to exclude the possibility of Syrian professors, far from it, but it is clear that if we wish to encourage Arabic studies in America it must be made

possible for the most proficient American Arabists to obtain university chairs. Moreover, some of the Syrian assistants might be recruited among men especially skilful for the humbler but indispensable linguistic drilling yet less qualified for professorial teaching.

15. For the reasons explained in number 12, it would be desirable if all the Syrian instructors came from the same Arabic country, or even from the same locality and nursery, for example, the American University of Beirūt. This would insure the standardization of the Arabic taught in America. It obviously would be better if all Americans spoke Arabic in the same manner and with the same intonation. This might even contribute to the standardization of the Arabic language all over the world.

16. Nobody should be allowed to teach Arabic, even the most elementary kind, whose pronunciation has not been vouched for by Arabic-speaking people. The teachers should be able to speak it in such a way that *some* Arabic people at least, if not all, could understand them. I imagine that some western Arabists whose reading of Arabic would be utterly unintelligible to any kind of Arabic-speaking men would invoke as an excuse that Arabic is pronounced differently in different countries.

Such an excuse cannot be countenanced for a moment, for however great the variety of Arabic speech, it should not be artificially increased! Moreover, there are great regularities all across the Arabic world: long vowels are always pronounced differently from the short ones; the accent is almost always placed in the same way; most of the consonants are articulated in the same way, and when there are differences these differences are maintained consistently; double consonants are always distinctly heard, etc. It is quite true that some Arabic words (even as some English ones) can be vocalized in more than one way, but that does not justify a random pronunciation of them.

It is typical of the artificiality of Arabic teaching in the West today that while one carefully inquires into the Hebrew and Syriac knowledge of a prospective teacher of Arabic, no one ever seems to ask if he can read (let alone speak) that language intelligibly. And yet think of the infinite damage for which such

a teacher will be responsible. For thanks to his ignorance, many generations of students will be given an absolutely false idea of a beautiful language. A professor who would teach false grammar would be kicked out (if he were discovered) but many professors are actually teaching a false pronunciation and that does not seem to matter.

Some years ago one of the most prominent orientalists of Europe delivered an Arabic lecture in Beirût. He was greeted by a large audience, including many Arabic men of letters, but nobody understood a word of what he said. They applauded vigorously and it is possible that the great orientalist never suspected what had happened. If he had he might perhaps have flattered himself with the delusion that his Arabic was too good for them (many western orientalists have such foolish illusions). The truth is that he could not pronounce Arabic properly, that no Arabic audience could possibly have understood him, and that the only people who might have understood him would have been his own pupils or other orientalists mispronouncing Arabic in the same way.

Is this not infinitely pathetic? For the spoken language is the real one. It is not more difficult to teach the correct pronunciation than an incorrect one. Why should students be taught something which is false? Once more I do not claim any intrinsic superiority for Syrian Arabic. If professors taught a kind of Arabic which could be understood in Tlemcen, or in Fez, or in Aleppo, or in any Arabic-speaking community they could justify themselves, but there is no justification whatever for teaching a kind of Arabic which could not be understood anywhere.

17. Two of the best exercises in the teaching of a language like Arabic are on the one hand writing under dictation, on the other hand reading aloud. But it is clear that these exercises will do more harm than good, if the teacher does not know how to pronounce Arabic correctly. In fact if the teacher is not sure of his orthophony he should avoid dictation, but unfortunately reading aloud either by himself or by his students can never be entirely avoided, and hence if the teacher's pronunciation is bad, the very source of his teaching is poisoned.

But if the teacher is able to speak Arabic in such a manner that an Arabic audience would understand him without ambiguity, dictation to the students will be one of the best means of measuring their proficiency. Good reading aloud will help them to understand a text—and if in their turn they are able to read it well, they will thus prove their understanding of it in the simplest manner.

18. In the teaching of Arabic immense pains should be taken at the very beginning to insure orthophony and calligraphy. Of course this would imply a very long and tedious drill which would discourage many students, but this would not matter, for the surviving ones would be better. The majority of our pedagogues seem to believe that something is gained by obliging a large number of boys and girls to obtain a mediocre and sterile knowledge of Latin and Greek. Such stupidity should be avoided in our field. Instead of trying to get many students interested in Arabic and Hebrew, it would be wiser to magnify the difficulty and tediousness of the task at the very beginning and so discourage as fast as possible all the students but the best. There is a great need for good Arabists—and an immense amount of work is waiting for them—but there is no need whatever for mediocre ones.

19. However proficient the young Arabic student be he should not be granted a master's degree without at least a year's residence in an Arabic-speaking country, nor a doctor's degree without a residence of at least two or three years.

The needs of Arabic study and research would be served better by the organization of strong Arabic departments in a very few universities or colleges than by stray courses in a great many more. For in the first case, there would be constant check, emulation, and progress, and the standards would be higher. In a strong department including, let us say, two or three professors and four to nine Syrian assistants, it would be possible to create an Arabic atmosphere. The students could already obtain a fair knowledge of the language before going to the East, and their visit to the East being better prepared, would thus be far more profitable.

Istanbul, May 1932.

WILLIAM G. SHELLABEAR
Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford
Seminary Foundation

A MALAY TREATISE ON POPULAR
SŪFĪ PRACTICES

A MALAY TREATISE ON POPULAR SŪFĪ PRACTICES

By WILLIAM G. SHELLABEAR

THE following is the translation of a book printed at Mecca in A.H. 1323, under the title *Fathu'l-Ārifīn*. On the title page the statement is made that it has been translated into the Malay language, presumably from the Arabic, and that it explains the *bay'ah* (covenant with the Shaikh), the *dhikr* and the *silsilah* (chain of authorities) of the Qādirīyah and Naqshbandīyah Orders.

The first part of what is here translated into English is printed on the margin of the Mecca edition, and I have termed it the Introduction. It is described as "a statement by the Shaikh who possesses this Order," and he seems to be the same person who is referred to at the commencement of the main part of the book, just before the Preface (*muqaddimah*), where "our Shaikh's" name is given as "Shaikh Aḥmad Khaṭīb ibn 'Abdu'l-Ghaḥfār Sambās, who lived and died at the illustrious city of Mecca," Sambas being a Malay sultanate on the west coast of Borneo. The Order which is said to belong to this teacher or Shaikh appears to be the Sammānīyah Order, for we find in the Introduction the statement that "this Order of Sammān comprises all these Orders which have been mentioned"—namely, the Naqshbandīyah, Qādirīyah, Ṭarīqatu'l-Anfās,¹ Ṭarīqatu'l-Junayd, and Ṭarīqatu'l-Muwāfaqah.

Only a very brief mention is made of the Sammānīyah Order in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, under the article "Ṭarīqa," as follows: "Sammāniya—Egyptian branch of Shādhiliya (xixth century)." In the *Encyclopedie voor Nederlandsch Oost Indie*, s.v. "Sammān," it is stated that the full name of the founder of this

¹ Dr. D. A. Rinkes, in his thesis for the doctorate at Leiden University, entitled *Abdoerraef van Singkel*, states that the *dhikru'l-anfās* is mentioned in 'Abdu'l-Ra'ūf's (unpublished) work, *'Umdatul-Muḥtājīn*, but I have not found any reference to a *ṭarīqah* of that name.

Order was Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdu’l-Karīm al-Sammān, and the following account of him is given: “This mystical teacher, revered as a saint in the Netherlands Indies, lived at al-Madīna in the first half of the eighteenth century. The mystical Order which bears his name is the Ṭarīqah Sammānīyah. The so-called *rātib Sammān*, established by Sammān, is well known in the Netherlands Indies; it consists of violent movements of the body, accompanying very noisy religious ceremonies, which serve as a means to induce a state of mystic ecstasy.” In the library of the Bataviaasch Genootschap at Batavia, Java, there are seven manuscripts of a life of Sammān, and in the Leiden University library in Holland there are two manuscripts of the same work, in which the date of the death of Sammān is given as A.H. 1189. A full account of the *rātib Sammān*, describing the noisy character of these religious rites, is given in Professor C. Snouck Hurgronje’s *The Achehnese*, Vol. II, pp. 216-20. The name of al-Shādhilī does not appear in the *silsilah* of the Order given in the Malay work here translated, and it seems possible that the Ṭarīqa Sammānīya given by Professor Massignon in his Ṭarīqa article as an Egyptian branch of the Shādhilīya may be a distinct Order from that mentioned in this work.

It should perhaps be mentioned that the teachings contained in this Malay book are considered heretical, and have been very severely criticized by certain orthodox Muḥammadans at Mecca, who published at Mecca in A.H. 1325 (A.D. 1907) a Malay book containing three treatises refuting the teachings contained in *Fathu’l-‘Ārifīn*, which had been published two years previously. See my article “An Exposure of Counterfeiters,” in *The Moslem World* for October 1930.

KITĀB FATHU’L-‘ĀRIFĪN

INTRODUCTION

Says the Shaikh who possesses this Order: This Order of ours is reckoned by the letters n q ṭ j m, and whoever does not come to us and accept it in our time will undoubtedly repent. What is meant by the letter “n” is the Naqshbandīyah Order, and by the

“q” the Qādirīyah Order, and by the “ṭ” the Ṭarīqatu’l-Anfās, and by the “j” the Order of Junayd, and by the “m” the Order of Muwāfaqah. Now the Naqshbandīyah Order uses the silent *dhikr*, holding the breath, and using the expression “*Allāh, Allāh,*” in their hearts, remembering God” to whom that name belongs, that is, God whose existence is necessary (*ṣāhib al-wujūd*)² and there is no one like Him. And the Qādirīyah Order has an audible *dhikr*, standing or sitting. The Ṭarīqatu’l-Anfās perform the *dhikr* by the way they breathe.’ The Junayd Order is thus—they recite “*subḥāna’llāh*” on the first day [Sunday] four thousand times, and they recite “*al-ḥamdu lillāh*” on the second day four thousand times, and they recite “*lā ilāha illā’llāh*” on the third day four thousand times, and they recite “*Allāhu akbar*” on the fourth day four thousand times, and they recite “*lā ḥawla wa lā quwata illā bi’llāh*” on the fifth day four thousand times, and on the day of assembly they recite the ritual of worship (*ṣalāt*), and on the day *sabt* they recite “*istiḡfār*”; and they begin again on the first day with the above-mentioned arrangement. And the Order of Muwāfaqah perform a *wird* (approach) to the name of Allāh, consisting of the Beautiful Names of Allāh, agreeing in number with the names or approximating to the names, as the reckoning is recorded in the Beautiful Names as to their numbers and letters. This Order of Sammān comprises all these Orders which have been mentioned.

Now a part of the glory of that exalted phrase (*kalimah*)⁴ is that the law (*shar‘*) does not accept the faith of anyone except with it, it is the price of [entrance into] heaven, and it is the redemption from the fire of hell; from the fact that its words are few, it is easy for the tongue which recites it; and it has twenty-four letters, being the same number as the hours of the day and night, which indicates that whoever recites it once, with each letter he does away with the sin of one hour which he has committed during a day and a night; also it has seven words, being the

² The word rendered “God” here and throughout this translation is the Malay word *Tuhan*, which Muslims use exclusively of the Deity. Where *Allāh* occurs in the Malay text, it has not been translated.

³ See Rinkes, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-2.

⁴ Namely: *Lā ilāha illā’llāh, Muḥammad^{un} rasūlu’llāh*.

same number as the gates of hell, and the same number as those members [of the body] which usually tend to sin, namely, the two eyes, the two ears, the two hands, the two feet, the tongue, the belly and the private parts, so whoever recites it, the seven gates of hell are closed [for him thereby], and the sin of his seven members falls away; moreover it has no dotted letters, which indicates that he who recites it should have his heart free from all except Allāh, in order that its mysteries and benefits may be obtained. The Prophet, may Allāh have mercy on him and give him peace, said, "Whoever recites *Lā ilāha illā'llāh*, prolonging the recitation, four thousand great sins will surely be made null and void for him." The Companions asked, "O Messenger of Allāh, what if he has not any great sin?" He replied, "All his family and neighbors will be pardoned on his behalf." This Tradition is narrated by Ibn al-Bukhārī from Anas. As for the explanation of lengthening it with the *madd* of separation—concentrate on the *alif* of *lā ilāha*, that is, fourteen vowel sounds, and lengthen *Allāh* to the extent of three *alifs*, and separate between the two *madds*, which means that each *alif madd* [lengthened *alif*] should be produced with one breath, except when the teacher orders [otherwise] or when an unbeliever becomes a Muslim, then do not lengthen it, so that he may quickly transfer from his unbelief to Islām. This [the *kalimah*] is the least act [of worship] that should be performed after each of the five times of worship; and if it is omitted, then it should be made up for, and if one desires more than this act of worship, one should perform it.

The independence of the Deity (*al-ilāh*) in regard to everything besides Himself. That which is included in what is necessary to that independence is eleven things—first, Existence; secondly, Priority; thirdly, Continuance; fourthly, Difference from originated things; fifthly, His being self-subsistent; sixthly, Hearing; seventhly, Seeing; eighthly, Speech; ninthly, Being a Hearer; tenthly, Being one who sees; and eleventhly, Being a Speaker; the opposites are eleven, so the total becomes twenty-two. Now what may [possibly] be included in independence is three things—first, He may do all possible things or omit

them, the opposite of this being necessary or impossible; secondly, He gains no advantage from all that He does or decides; and thirdly, the whole universe makes no impression by its own power (*qūwah*). The opposites of these two are two, so the total becomes twenty-eight.⁵

The dependence upon Him of everything besides Himself. That which is included in what is necessary to dependence is nine things—first, Power; secondly, Will; thirdly, Knowledge; fourthly, Life; fifthly, Being Powerful; sixthly, Being a Willer; seventhly, Being a Knower; eighthly, Being a Living One; ninthly, Unity; the opposites are nine, so the total becomes eighteen. And what may [possibly] be included in dependence is two things—first, this whole universe being originated; and secondly, this whole universe making no impression by its own nature; their opposites are also two, so it becomes twenty-two. Now add that which is included in independence to that in dependence, and it becomes exactly fifty.

To perform the acts of worship of the Naqshbandīyah Order, one must be purified by bathing and the water of ablutions, then one sits facing the *qiblah*, with the head bowed and both eyes closed, then behold the blessed word (*lafẓ mubārak*), that is, the word *Allāh*, in the heart which is called the pineapple heart [Malay: *hati sanubarī*],⁶ and at the time one is beholding that word (*lafẓ*), meditate upon God who has none like Him who possesses that name, that is, the essence of God who is necessary of existence (*wājib al-wujūd*). He has no place, He is not on the right, He is not on the left, He is not below, He is not in front, and He is not behind, because we are looking into the heart; but that is His name, and while we are looking let us meditate upon God

⁵ The addition here is not very clear, but apparently the first of these three things is taken as two, namely, doing or omitting all possible things, and that leaves the secondly and thirdly with their two opposites to be reckoned as four, thus making a total of six, to be added to the previous twenty-two.

⁶ The Arabic *ṣanaubar* means pine cone, and is used by Malays for the pineapple, owing to its conical shape; *ṣanaubarī* means conical, and *hati sanubarī* or *jantong* are used by Malays for the anatomical heart. Rinkes states that the same expression is used by 'Abdu'l-Ra'ūf in his *'Umdatul-Muhtājīn*; see Rinkes, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

who possesses that name. So at that time let us cause our own existence and attributes and acts to pass away (*fanā'*); and there will be no existence but His existence and His attributes and acts. This should be done at each time [of worship] (*waqt*). This is called *tawajjuh*, that is, directing oneself towards God, so as to make the words *Allāh*, *Allāh*, to be present in the heart at the time one is sitting or standing or lying down; so one fixes one's thoughts entirely upon the essence of his God; that is what is to be understood by the word of Allāh, He is exalted: *Alladhīna yadhkurūna'llāha qiyām^{an} wa qu'ūd^{an} wa 'alā junūbihim*, meaning, "Who mention Allāh whether standing or sitting or lying down" [Qur'ān iii: 188]. So when one has carefully beheld the subtlety (*latīfah*) of the heart (*qalb*), he then transfers to the subtlety of the spirit (*rūh*), and afterwards to the subtlety of the consciousness (*sirr*), and afterwards to the subtlety of the hidden being (*khaḥfā*), and afterwards to the subtlety of the most hidden being (*akhḥfā*). And when these five mention Allāh, He is exalted, then all his members remember to mention Allāh, He is exalted, at every time and period; whether waking or sleeping, it is the same.

The subtlety of the heart is colored yellow, and is the place of authority (*wilāyah*) of our lord Adam, on whom be peace; its origin is water, fire, air, earth.

The subtlety of the spirit is colored red, and is the place of authority of our lords Abraham and Noah, on whom be peace, its origin is fire.

The subtlety of the consciousness is colored white, and is the place of authority of our lord Moses, on whom be peace; its origin is water.

The subtlety of the hidden being is colored green, and is the place of authority of our lord 'Isā [Jesus], on whom be peace; its origin is wind.

The subtlety of the most hidden being is colored black, and is the place of authority of our lord Muḥammad, may Allāh have mercy on him and give him peace; its origin is earth.⁷

⁷ In regard to colors in relation to the *latīfah*, see Fleischer's *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 440-9; and also *Studies in Tasawwuf*, by Khaja

MĀ SHĀ' ALLĀH

Bİ'SMI'LLĀHI'L-RAHMĀNI'L-RAHİM

All praise is established for Allāh, He is exalted, and the mercy of Allāh and His peace are upon the messenger of Allāh, that is, the prophet Muḥammad, may Allāh have mercy upon him and give him peace; and after that, this is a book and a small treatise to explain the covenant (*bay'ah*), the *dhikr* and the *silsilah* of the Orders described as Qādirīyah, for our lord 'Abdu'l-Qādir al-Jilānī, and Naqshbandīyah. Both these Orders are united for the Qādirīyah *silsilah*, that is, for our Shaikh and teacher, the most learned and enlightened theologian, our lord Shaikh Aḥmad Khaṭīb ibn 'Abdu'l-Ghaffār Sambās, who lived and died at the illustrious city of Mecca.

Preface (*muqaddimah*). This is a preface as to the method of instruction (*kayfīyah talqīn*) and the covenant (*bay'ah*) of our teacher mentioned above. Both the teacher and his pupil should first recite together seven times as follows: "*Bī'smi'llāhi'l-Rahmāni'l-Rahīm*, O Allāh, open up to me the victories (*futūḥ*) of the adepts (*'ārifīn*)"; and afterwards recite twice: "*Bī'smi'llāhi'l-Rahmāni'l-Rahīm*, all praise belongs to Allāh, and mercy and peace upon the beloved, the high and great, our lord Muḥammad, the leader into the straight path. *Bī'smi'llāhi'l-Rahmāni'l-Rahīm*, I ask pardon of Allāh, the forgiving, the merciful." Then twice: "O Allāh, have mercy upon our lord Muḥammad, and upon his family and companions, and give them peace." Afterwards they recite the *dhikr* three times: *Lā ilāha illā'llāh*, the teacher first, and the pupil also says it three times; and afterwards he ends with: "Our lord Muḥammad is the messenger of Allāh, may Allāh have mercy upon him and give him peace." Then the teacher says first, and the pupil after him, both of them reciting: "O Allāh, have mercy upon our lord Muḥammad with a mercy by which Thou wilt save us from all terrors and misfortunes, and by which Thou wilt supply all our needs, and by which Thou wilt cleanse us from all iniquities, and by which Thou wilt elevate us to the highest ranks, and by which Thou wilt cause us

Khan, B.A., Madras, 1923, pp. 81, 82, quoted in the note at the end of my article in *The Moslem World*, 1930, p. 369.

to reach the furthest limits of all good things in this life and after death." Then they will recite: "Those who give their allegiance to thee are giving their allegiance (*yubāyi'ūna*) only to Allāh; the hand of Allāh is above their hands, so he who breaks faith will break faith with himself only, and he who keeps the covenant which Allāh has made with him (*man awfā bimā 'ahada 'alayhi'llāh*) will receive from Allāh a great reward." Then they will recite the *Fātiḥah* for all the teachers of the Qādirīyah and Naqshbandīyah *silsilah*, especially for the chief of the saints (*sultān al-awliyā'*) our lord Shaikh 'Abdu'l-Qādir al-Jilānī, and for the lord of the Sūfī sect (*al-tā'ifatu'l-Ṣūfīyah*) my lord Shaikh Junayd al-Baghdādī, may Allāh sanctify the hearts (*sirr*) of both of them. Then the teacher will recite a petition (*du'ā*) on behalf of the pupil, such as will be easy for him; and afterwards the teacher will direct the gaze (*tawajjuh*) of the pupil a thousand times, or more than a thousand times.

Be it known to thee, O traveller on the Path (*sālik*), that man is composed of ten subtleties, five of which are called '*ālam al-amr* [the world of command], and they are: the subtlety of the heart (*laṭīfatu'l-qalb*), of the spirit (*rūh*), the consciousness (*sirr*), the hidden being (*khafā*), and the most hidden being (*akhfā*); and five of them are called '*ālam al-khalq* [the world of creation], and they are the subtlety of the soul (*laṭīfatu'l-nafs*) and the four elements (*'anāṣir*), which means the origins of creation, and they are: water, air, fire and earth; and the subtlety of the soul is the subtlety of the brain, as will follow later.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE METHOD OF INITIATION INTO THE QĀDIRĪYAH ORDER

The request for pardon (*istighfār*) must be recited at least twice or twenty times, saying: "I ask pardon of Allāh, the pardoning and the merciful One"; then recite a prayer (*ṣalāt*) as before, saying: "O Allāh, have mercy (*ṣalli*) upon our lord Muḥammad and his family and companions, and give them peace." Afterwards recite the *dhikr*: *Lā ilāha illā'llāh* one hundred and sixty times after the completion of each of the five times of worship; and besides that recite the *dhikr* as much as one is able, lengthening the word *lā*, picturing it in one's thoughts from the navel as

far as the brains in one's head, and following with the word *ilāha* to the right, and driving it with the words *illā'llāh* into the pineapple heart, that is, the shape of the fruit called *sanūbarī*, which the Malays call *jantong*,⁸ with a strong effort, so that the illustrious words may pass through the five subtleties, while one remembers the meaning of this sentence: *Lā maqsūda illā'llāh*, meaning, "there is nothing purposed except Allāh," He is exalted, which is the name for the essence of God—there is nothing similar to Him, and He is described by all the attributes of perfection and praise without limit, some of which are the twenty necessary attributes, and by His purity He is far removed from the attributes of dependence and limitless imperfection, some of which are the twenty opposites, which are impossible. Meanwhile await the abundance of favor from God, some of which should come by way of the teacher, while we picture before us the form of the Shaikh, if the Shaikh (that is, the teacher) is absent, directing the heart towards the teacher by *tarwajjuh*; and if he is near in the presence of the pupil, then simply await his abundant favor. This is the *dhikr* of negation and corroboration (*naḥyū ithbāt*);⁹ it is just the same whether it is performed audibly or silently. And when the *dhikr* is completed, then say: "Our lord Muḥammad is the messenger of Allāh; may Allāh have mercy upon him and give him peace." Afterwards recite the prayer (*ṣalāt*): "O Allāh, have mercy upon our lord Muḥammad with a mercy by which Thou wilt save us from all terrors and misfortunes," etc., to the end. Then recite a *Fātiḥah* for our lord the messenger of Allāh, may Allāh have mercy upon him and give peace to him, and to his companions, and to all the Shaikhs of the Qādirīyah and Naqshbandīyah *silsilah*, especially our lord the Shaikh 'Abdu'l-Qādir al-Jīlānī and our lord the Shaikh Junayd al-Baghdādī, may Allāh sanctify the hearts (*sirr*) of both of them, and also the Shaikh Khaṭīb Sambās, and our fathers and our mothers and our brethren the Muslim men and women, and the believing men and women, those of them who are living and the dead, and peace [to them].

⁸ See note 6.

⁹ The negation is *lā ilāha*, there is no Deity; and the corroboration is *illā'llāh*, except Allāh.

should be pictured before the heart, if the Shaikh is absent, and if he is before us, then we should simply await his abundant favor, reciting the *dhikr* with the thoughts directed to the subtlety of the heart (*qalb*), which is below the left breast about two fingers' breadth inclining towards the left side, remembering what is understood by the name which is spoken: *Allāh, Allāh*, that is, the essence or self of our God, there is nothing like Him, and He is described by all the attributes of perfection and praise without limit, some of which are the twenty necessary attributes, and by His purity He is far removed from the attributes of dependence and limitless imperfection, some of which are the twenty opposites, which are impossible, the opposites of the necessary attributes. Meanwhile waiting for the abundant favor which cannot be limited, the tongue is brought to the roof of the mouth, and both eyes are closed, and when one notices the movement of *dhikr* in the heart,¹² by the blessing of directing the thoughts upon our Shaikh (*barakah tawajjuh shaykh*), and by much recital of the *dhikr*, we transfer, with the permission of our teacher, to the subtlety of the spirit (*rūh*), which is below the right breast, at a distance of two fingers' breadth, inclining towards the right side, reciting the *dhikr* just as in the [subtlety of the] heart. And when one notices the movement of the *dhikr*, as in the heart, then we transfer, with the command of our teacher, to the subtlety of the consciousness (*sirr*), which is in line with the left breast, at a distance of two fingers' breadth towards the chest, reciting the *dhikr* just as in the [subtlety of the] spirit. And when we notice the movement of the *dhikr* there, we transfer again, by command of our teacher, to the subtlety of the hidden being (*khafā*), which is in line with the right breast, at a distance of two fingers' breadth towards the chest, and recite the *dhikr* there, as in the consciousness (*sirr*). And when we notice the movement of the *dhikr* there, we transfer again, by command of our teacher, to the subtlety of the most hidden being (*akhfā*), which is in the middle of the chest, and recite the *dhikr* there. And when we notice the movement of the *dhikr* there, we transfer again, by command of our

¹² This movement in the heart is referred to later as the *kayfīyah*, that is, the method of the *dhikr*.

teacher, to the *latīfatu'l-nafs*, meaning, the subtlety of the brain [*sic*] which is in the forehead and all [perhaps this means all the head or all the body], and recite the *dhikr* there. And when we notice the movement of the *dhikr* there, we transfer again, by command of our teacher, to the *latīfatu'l-qalb*, meaning the subtlety of the entire body, equipping the whole body from the head to the ends of the feet, until we notice the movement of the *dhikr* in all the five subtleties which are in the breast, and in the *latīfatu'l-nafs* and the *latīfatu'l-qalb*. After several times, whether we are reciting the *dhikr* with the name of the essence, that is: *Allāh*, *Allāh*, or reciting the *dhikr* of negation and corroboration (*naḥyū ithbāt*), that is: *Lā ilāha illā'llāh*, saying *Allāh* with the thoughts of the heart or with the tongue, one recites: *Allāhumma, anta maqsūdī wa riḍāka maṭlūbī; a'tinī mahabbataka wa ma'rifataka*, which means, "O my God, it is Thou whom I desire, and Thy good pleasure is what I seek; bestow upon me Thy love and acquaintance with Thee." If one recites the *dhikr* audibly with the tongue, with the correct words and remembering the meaning, fixing it in the heart as in the presence of *Allāh*, that is, the essence (*dhāt*) to which there is none like, in so doing an impression¹³ is produced. When one notices the method (*kayfīyah*), that is, the movement of the *dhikr*, and also the union (*jam'īyah*), that is, the permanent strength of the *dhikr*, then continue with gratitude and pleasure until it becomes one's method (*kayfīyah*) thereby, that is, a permanent *dhikr*, so as to be the same whether asleep or awake, and becomes natural (*ṭab'īyah*).

The people of the Path (*ahl al-ṭarīqah*) have said that there are three requirements for attaining to [union with] *Allāh*, He is exalted—(1) The silent *dhikr*, that is, the *dhikr* in one's mind, which is presented by a heart which is freed from all random thoughts (*khawāṭir*), that is, do not think of anything in the past or in the future or in the present, and do not let the heart dwell upon what the eye sees, nor dwell upon any thought other than *Allāh*, He is exalted; (2) Meditation (*murāqabah*), which

¹³ The Malay word here used (*bēkas*) is practically identical in meaning with the Arabic *athar*, which it is apparently intended to represent.

means that the heart keeps watching for Allāh, He is exalted, as a cat watches for a rat which has gone into a hole, while waiting for the abundance of the favor which has no limit, and (3) Being devoted to one's service (*khidmah*) to the Shaikh, that is, the teacher who produces the impression¹⁸ for concentration (*tawajjuh*), and union (*jam'iyah*) and method (*kayfīyah*). These are the three things which are essential for the traveller (*sālik*) who is on the way to Allāh, He is exalted, that is, the people of the Path (*ahl al-ṭarīqah*).

The following are the twenty Meditations—(1) *Murāqabatul-aḥadīyah* [The Meditation of the Unity of Allāh], that is, watching for God who is one, namely, the directing (*tawajjuh*) of the heart to the presence of the essence (*ḥaḍrat dhāt*) of God, who is one in the attributes of perfection and praise without limit, some of which are the twenty necessary attributes, and by His purity is far removed from the attributes of dependence and limitless imperfection, some of which are the twenty impossible attributes, the opposites of the twenty which are necessary; meanwhile waiting for the abundance of favor from God, who is too great and too glorious to be in any of the six directions, namely, above, below, right, left, before and behind, which is one of the things which are essential for Him in the word of Allāh: *Qul, huwa'llāhu aḥad*, meaning, "Say, O Muḥammad, God is one" [Qur. cxii: 1]. And when there is union (*jam'iyah*), that is, permanency of the movement of the *dhikr*, and all random thoughts (*kharwātir*) are absent for at least four hours, then one transfers, by command of the teacher, to *Murāqabatul-ma'iyah* [The Meditation of Concomitance], that is, concentration (*tawajjuh*) in directing the heart towards the essence (*dhāt*) of God who is together with us in every part (*juz'*), that is, our subdivisions are together with God, hearing, seeing, speech, the feeling of the members, and the tongue and the smelling; but we do not know the way He is with us or how is the modality (*kayfīyah*) of it, Allāh alone knows fully, and the proof is the word of Allāh, He is exalted—*Wa huwa ma'akum aynamā kuntum* [Qur. lvii: 4], meaning, "And Allāh is with you wherever you are"; that is, we believe in a con-

comitance which is figurative (*ma'nawī*). All this help is the action of those who meditate in *wilāyatu'l-ṣughrā*, that is, the lesser [authority]. When one ceases the concentration (*tarwajjuh*) in the six directions, and is no longer waiting, then proceed and transfer to *Murāqabatu'l-aqrabīyah* [The Meditation of Proximity], that is, concentration on the essence of our God, who is nearer to us than the artery of our neck, nearer to our hearing, nearer to the seeing of our eyes, nearer to the smelling of our noses, and nearer to the taste of our tongues, and nearer to the thinking of our hearts, and nearer to all our members; but we do not know the modality (*kayfīyah*) of His nearness, only Allāh [knows]. And while we are thinking of the impression (*athar*),¹⁸ that He has created mankind such as us, and has made all animals that creep on the earth and that fly in the air, and all the creatures that are in the sea, and we are thinking also of the '*ālamu'l-'ulwā*, meaning the upper universe, and the creation of the seven spheres of the sky and all that are contained in them, such as the moon and sun and stars and clouds; then we also think of the '*ālamu'l-suflā*, meaning the lower universe, and the creation of the ocean and dry land and mountains and plains, and such things as trees and rocks and all that grows; and the proof of it is the word of Allāh, He is exalted: *Wa nahnu aqrabu ilayhi min ḥablil-warīd* [Qur. 1: 15], which means, "We are nearer to Him than the neck artery." Secondly, and awaiting the abundance of favor upon the *latīfatu'l-nafs* [subtlety of the soul], and participating with all the five subtleties which are in the breast and are called '*ālamu'l-amr* [world of command], that is, the subtlety of the heart (*qalb*), and the subtlety of the spirit (*rūh*), and the subtlety of the consciousness (*sirr*), and the subtlety of the hidden being (*khafā*), and the subtlety of the most hidden being (*akhfā*).

This is the place of the license (*maḥallu'l-ijāzah*)—*Albastuka khirqata'l-faqīrīyati, wa ajastuka ijāzat^{an} muṭlaqat^{an} lil-irshādi wa'l-ijāzati, wa ja'altuka khalīfah* ["I have clothed thee with the patched robe of poverty, and have licensed thee with an absolute license for guidance and authority, and have made thee a successor"]; and his pupil replies: *Qabiltu* ["I have accepted"].

This is as far as what is called *wilāyatu'l-ṣuḡhrā* [The Lesser Authority].

Now what is done by the person in the *dā'irah wilāyati'l-kubrā* [The Circle of the Greater Authority]¹⁴ is to transfer next, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu'l-maḥabbati fī'l-dā'irati'l-ūlā* [The Meditation of Love in the First Circle], which means, the watching of concentration on the God who loves and is loved in the first circle, that is, the first station (*maqām*) and degrees (*darajāt*) of concentration upon the essence of our God who loves us and we also love Him, while we look with the eyes of the heart at the essence of our God who possesses all the names of unlimited goodness, some of which are the beautiful names (*asmā' u'l-ḥusnā*), which are called ninety-nine, and we look at Him who possesses all acts whose bounties are unlimited towards the *laḥīfatu'l-nafs* [subtlety of the soul].

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu'l-maḥabbati fī'l-dā'irati'l-thānīyah* [The Meditation of Love in the Second Circle], which means, the concentration of watching God who loves and is loved in the second circle, that is, the concentration upon the essence of our God who loves us and we also love Him, while we look with our eyes at Him who is described with the attributes which are ideas (*ṣifah ma'ānī*) and those connected with ideas (*ma'nawīyah*),¹⁵ and bounties upon the subtlety of the soul.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu'l-maḥabbati fī'l-qaws* [The Meditation of Love in the Arc], which means, the concentration of watching God who loves and is loved in the half-circle, that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who loves us and we also love Him. Now the proof of those three Meditations is that Allāh said, He is

¹⁴ The Greater Authority appears to commence after the license is conferred upon the pupil.

¹⁵ Attributes which are ideas, such as Power, Will, etc., are abstract, and are said by some Muslim theologians to require a link to connect them with created beings, this link being found in the attributes connected with ideas, such as, Being Powerful, Being One who wills, etc., which picture Allāh as actively exercising the qualities stated abstractly. This is the explanation of al-Sanūsī.

exalted: *Yuḥibbuhum wa yuḥabbūnahu* [Qur. v: 59], meaning, "He loves them, and they love Him"; and bounties upon the subtlety of the soul.

Then this is the concentration (*taṣawwuj*) which is called *wilāyatu'l-ʿulyā* [The Highest Authority], that is, transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu wilāyati'l-ʿulyā* [The Meditation of the Highest Authority], watching God who made the highest authority, that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the authority of the angels (*wilāyat malāʾikat*), that is, the inward control, which He Himself then called "inward" (*bāṭin*), the proof of which is the word of Allāh, He is exalted: *Huwa'l-awwalu wa'l-ākhiru wa'l-ẓāhiru wa'l-bāṭin* [Qur. lvii: 3], [He is the first and the last, and the outward and the inward], meaning, He is God who is first, without beginning, and last, without end; and He is God who is the outward, and He is also the inward. And the bounty is upon the three elements (*wa'l-fayḍu 'alā'l-'anāsiri'l-thalāth*), that is, water, fire, wind.

Then transfer, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu kamālāti'l-nubūwah* [The Meditation of the Perfections of Prophetship], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the perfections of all the prophets, and who gave to them the commands of the canon law (*sharʿ*). And bounties are upon the element of earth (*'unṣur al-turāb*) only, that is, creatures made of earth.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu kamālāti'l-risālah* [The Meditation of the Perfections of the Messengership], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the perfections of all the messengers, that is, He gave them the commands of the canon law more perfectly than the perfections of the prophetship, because the messenger is greater than the prophet who is not a messenger. And the bounty is upon the condition of unity (*hay'atu'l-waḥdānīyah*), which is an expression for the combination of the ten subtleties, five of which are called *'ālamu'l-amr* [the world of command], which are in the breast, that is, the subtleties of the heart and spirit and consciousness and hidden being and most hidden being;

and five of them are called *‘ālamu’l-khalq* [the world of creation], that is, the subtlety of the soul (*nafs*) and the four elements, that is, brain, water, air, fire, earth; by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu kamālāti ūlū’l-‘azm* [The Meditation of the Perfections of the Possessors of Determination], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the perfections of the *Ūlū’l-‘azm* more perfect than the perfections of the prophetship and the perfections of the messengership, the proof of which is the word of Allāh, He is exalted: *Fa’ṣbir kamā ṣabara ūlū’l-‘azmi minā’l-rusul* [Qur. xlvī: 35],¹⁶ meaning, “Be patient, O Muḥammad, as the *ūlū’l-‘azm* of the messengers were patient.” And bounties are upon the condition of unity, which is an expression for the combination of the ten subtleties [etc., as above].

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu’l-maḥabbati fī dā’irati’l-khullah* [The Meditation of Love in the Circle of Sincere Friendship], meaning, the watching of God in the station (*maqām*) of love, that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the reality (*ḥaqīqah*) of our lord Abraham, taking him as his beloved, according to His saying, He is exalted: *Wa’ttakhadhū llāhu Ibrāhīma khalīlā* [Qur. iv: 125], meaning, “Allāh, He is exalted, took the prophet Abraham as his beloved.” And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, which is an expression for the combination of the ten subtleties [etc., as above].

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu dā’irati’l-maḥabbati’l-ṣirfati hiya ḥaqīqatu sayyidīnā Mūsā* [The Meditation of the Circle of Pure Love, it is the Reality of our lord Moses], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who threw love, that is, bestowed love upon our lord Moses as pure love, like His saying, He is exalted: *Wa alqaytu ‘alayka maḥabbat^{an} minnī* [Qur. xx: 39], meaning, “And I threw, meaning I gave, upon you, O Moses, pure love from me.”

¹⁶ Baydāwī gives the names of the *ūlū’l-‘azm* as: Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus; and says that others add Jacob, Joseph, Job, and David. These are all given by al-Zamakhsharī in his *Kashshāf*, and also Isaac.

And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, which is [etc., as above].

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu'l-dhātīyatu'l-mumtazījatu bi'l-maḥabbati wa hiya ḥaqīqatu'l-Muḥammadīyah* [The Essential Meditation Mixed with Love, it is the Reality of Muḥammad], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the reality of Muḥammad from original love, which was mixed with him whom He loved, like His saying, He is exalted: *Wa mā Muḥammad^{un} illā rasūl* [Qur. iii:138], meaning, "And Muḥammad is no more than a messenger." And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu'l-maḥbūbīyati'l-ṣīrfati wa hiya ḥaqīqatu'l-Aḥmadīyah* [The Meditation of the Beloved who is pure, and it is the Reality of Aḥmad], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the reality of Aḥmad entirely from what He loved, like His saying, He is exalted: *Wa mubashshir^{an} bi rasūl^{an} ya'tī min ba'dī'smuhu Aḥmad* [Qur. lxi: 6], meaning, "Giving joyful news of a very great messenger who comes after me, the name of that messenger being Aḥmad." And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu'l-ḥubbī'l-ṣīrf* [The Meditation of Pure Love], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who gives pure love to His servants, whether it be love to God, or love to the Prophet, or love to angels, or love to Muslims, or love to anything, for all of it is that which is bestowed by God upon His servants, like His saying, He is exalted: *Wa'lladhīna āmanū ashaddu ḥubb^{an} lillāh* [Qur. ii: 160], meaning, "Those who believe in Allāh and His messenger are much beloved by Allāh, He is exalted." And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu lā ta'ayyana* [The Meditation of—He is not manifested], meaning, watching the essence of God who is not mani-

fest, that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who is not at all to be found by any person, whether it be the angels who are brought near, or even a prophet who is given a message, they do not in the least find the essence of our God, for there is no one who knows Allāh, but Allāh Himself; and this is an allusion (*ishārah*) to the verse in His word: *Laysa kamithlihi shay'^{un}, wa huwa'l-ṣamī'u'l-baṣīr* [Qur. xlii: 9], meaning, "There is not one like Him, and it is He who fully hears and fully sees"; and also an allusion to the verse: *Wa lam yakun lahu kufu'^{an} aḥad* ["And there is not one who is an equal to Him"]. And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu ḥaqīqatī'l-ka'abah* [The Meditation of the Reality of the *ka'abah*], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the reality of the *ka'abah* as a place of prostration (*sujūd*) of all possibilities (*mumkināt*), and the proof of it is: *Wa idh ja'alnā'l-bayta mathābat'^{an} lil-nās* [Qur. ii: 119, "And when We made the House a place of resort for men"]. And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu ḥaqīqatī'l-Qur'ān* [The Meditation of the Reality of the Qur'ān], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the reality of the Qur'ān, which is that which He sent down upon our lord Muḥammad, may Allāh have mercy upon him and give him peace, which is the service (*'ibādah*) of those who recite it, and the claim (*da'wā*) that there is a miracle in even the shortest of its chapters, as He said, He is exalted: *Wa in kuntum fī rayb'^m min mā nazzalnā 'alā 'abdinā fa'tū bī sūrat'^m min mithlihi* [Qur. ii:23, "And if ye be in any doubt as to what We sent down upon our servant, then bring a chapter like it"]. And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then, *Murāqabatu ḥaqīqatī'l-ṣalāt* [The Meditation of the Reality of the Worship], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God who made the reality of worship, which is a number

of words and actions beginning with the *takbīratu'l-iḥrām* [*Allāhu akbar*] and ending with the *salām*, with several stipulations laid down; and the proof of it is: *Inna'l-ṣalāta kānat 'alā'l-mu'minīna kitāb^{an} mawqūt^{an}* [Qur. iv: 104, "And the worship is for the believers prescribed and timed"]. And the bounty is upon the condition of unity, etc., by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

Then transfer again, with the permission of the Shaikh, to *Murāqabatu dā'irati'l-ma'būdīyati'l-ṣirfah* [The Meditation of the Circle of Pure Servitude], that is, concentration upon the essence of our God to whom belongs all the worship of all His creatures, and who has bestowed servitude upon all existing things, as He has said, He is exalted: *Wa mā khalaqtu'l-jinna wa'l-insa illā li ya'budūn* [Qur. li: 56, "And I did not create the jinn and mankind save that they might serve"]. And the bounty is upon the condition of unity [etc., as above], by the mediation of the Shaikhs, upon whom be mercy.

We have now finished the explanation (*talqīn*) of the *dhikr* and the covenant (*bay'ah*) of the Order, the license for which was given by our teacher, our lord and master, Shaikh Aḥmad Khaṭīb ibn 'Abdu'l-Ghaffār Sambās, who was in the exalted city of Mecca, to his pupils; may Allāh make him and the secrets of his knowledge (*'ulūm*) to be a benefit to us in this world and in the hereafter. Amen.

Then follows the chain of authorities (*silṣilah*) of the Shaikhs through whom these things were handed down by the prophet Muḥammad from the angel Gabriel.¹⁷

¹⁷ While reading the proofs, a later edition of this book has come to hand from Malaya. It was printed at Cairo in A.H. 1346, and with the exception of a few misprints and the omission of a word or two here and there, it is identical with the Mecca edition of A.H. 1323; but the latter part of what I have called the Introduction is inserted, by means of a footnote, at the commencement of the paragraph dealing with the Initiation into the Naqshbandīyah Order, that being the subject dealt with in this part of the Introduction.

WILLIAM THOMSON

*Associate Professor of Arabic, Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts*

KHĀRIJITISM AND THE KHĀRIJITES

KHĀRIJITISM AND THE KHĀRIJITES

By WILLIAM THOMSON

THE purpose of this paper is to call attention to some aspects of Khārijite history which have been somewhat neglected, and to propose a change in the point of view from which we at present consider the development of Khārijite doctrines. Briefly stated, the thesis maintained will be that our conceptions of the origin and nature of Khārijitism require revision, not only in the light of certain historical facts and the known geographical spread of Khārijite sects, but also because the inner relation of Khārijite thought to contemporary movements has not been clearly recognized and its true character defined.

Wellhausen criticizes Brünnow's idea that the Khārijites were true "Beduinenaraber," or, as Brünnow himself says, "Vollblutaraber aus den grossen Wüstenstämmen,"¹ but the disagreement between the two scholars is more verbal than real. For in the last analysis Brünnow's "Vollblutaraber" are just Wellhausen's "Ahl al-Ridda,"² Arabs who had fought in the Persian war and then been settled in Kūfa and Baṣra by the Khalīfa 'Umar.³ Wellhausen's objection is based on Brünnow's use of the word "Beduinen," on p. 26, but Brünnow's discussion on p. 8 shows that he did not mean by Beduinen the desert Arabs, as Wellhausen supposes, but simply the Arabs of Kūfa and Baṣra, who had once themselves been desert Arabs or were the descendants of desert Arabs. The actual basis of Wellhausen's criticism is his belief that the nature of the Bedouin had been changed by their settlement, a supposition which Brünnow apparently accepts,⁴ but the truth of which cannot be demonstrated by historical events. The Khalīfa 'Alī

¹ J. Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam* (Berlin, 1901), p. 8; R. E. Brünnow, *Die Charidschiten* (Leiden, 1884), p. 8.

² Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

³ Brünnow, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

⁴ *cf.* Brünnow, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

and his son, Ḥusayn, probably thought otherwise, and so did the Khalifa Mu'āwiya, who is reported to have said that in 'Irāq each man constituted a *shī'a* (party) for himself.⁵ The majority of the Arabs of 'Irāq seem to have retained much of their Bedouin nature for two generations at least. Only a minority of them seem to have been affected by religious ideas, and the question is, how did such come by their religious interests who were supposedly members of tribes that seceded from Islām as soon as its prophet died?

Lammens remarks in his *Mo'āwiya* on the curious fact that the Syrian Arabs never felt the contagion of Shī'ite or Khārijite ideas.⁶ 'Irāq and the East, together with the eastern and southern parts of Arabia, were the original homes of the sectarians, but more especially 'Irāq, and political conditions had undoubtedly something to do with this anomaly. For 'Irāq and the East were not only the homes of sectarianism, but also the seats of rebellion, during the whole of the Umayyad Khalifate, and, as Wellhausen says, the cause of the province became the cause of Islām.⁷ This, however, does not explain the rise of a great variety of sects, even with the political-religious constitution of Islām.

Brünnow and Wellhausen do not discuss the relation of the Arab conquerors to their subject peoples, the Aramaean heathen and Christians and the Persian Christians and Zoroastrians, nor their intermixture with these by marriage, concubinage, or clientship, and yet it is quite clear that such relationships had a quicker and profounder effect in 'Irāq than in Syria. Political conditions had some effect again most probably on the course of events, since the 'Irāqians, as the defeated and disaffected party in Islām, would more readily accept the aid of the subject peoples and be more susceptible to their influence. The Umayyad Khalifas, Mu'āwiya and Yazīd, had their Christian ministers and favorites, but the Syrian Arabs seem to have remained curiously insensible to the attractions of religious disputation and to intellectual dis-

⁵ *Kutāb al-'Iqd al-Farīd* (Cairo, A.H. 1305), Vol. II, p. 172; Ibn Qutayba, *Uyūn al-Akhbār* (Berlin, 1900), p. 267, l. 2.

⁶ *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth*, Vol. I (1906), p. 51; Vol. II (1907), p. 10.

⁷ Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* (Berlin, 1902), p. 38.

course in general, whereas the 'Irāqians exhibited an extraordinary receptivity. The different languages in use in the Christian churches of Syria and 'Irāq may have been in part the cause of this distinction between the two provinces, but a much more potent factor seems to have been the fact that the non-Arab population, Aramaean, Jew, and Persian, was comparatively far more numerous in proportion to the Arabs in 'Irāq than in Syria, and further, if not wholly, removed from the sphere of influence of the central Arab government in Damascus, to which their Arab fellow-countrymen were for the most part hostile. That in such circumstances Arab and non-Arab mingled with each other more readily and influenced each other more profoundly than in Syria, for example, the home province of the Umayyad Khalīfas, is scarcely to be questioned, and historical evidence points to a considerable intermixture of Arab with non-Arab and to the possibility, therefore, of the non-Arabs having influenced the Arabs not only from without, but also from within their own ranks.

The story of the Arab conquest of Mesopotamia, 'Irāq, and Persia, indicates that the Christian and Zoroastrian populations of these countries remained practically intact, and that these religions functioned as well, if not better, under Muslim dominion as under those of Byzantium and Persia. The Christian towns of Edessa, Nisibis, and Samosata, for example, capitulated to the Arab invaders under exceptionally favorable terms, including the preservation of their churches.⁸ The Persian towns of Ray and Qūmas surrendered on conditions quite as indulgent, namely, that the inhabitants should not be enslaved nor their fire-temples razed, and Adharbayjān seems to have been granted the same terms as Ray and Qūmas.⁹ And we find the Nestorian Catholicus, Yesu-yabh III (647-658), the contemporary of the Khalīfas, 'Uthmān and 'Alī, writing that "The Arabs to whom God at this time has granted the dominion over the world are, as you know, with us.

⁸ Balādhurī, *Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān*, edited by de Goeje (Leiden, 1866), pp. 414 ff.

⁹ Balādhurī, *The Origins of the Islamic State: being a Translation from the Arabic accompanied with annotations, geographic and historic notes of the Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān* (Vol. I translated by P. K. Hitti; Vol. II translated by F. C. Murgotten; New York, 1916 and 1924), Vol. II, pp. 4, 19 f.

Not only, however, are they not enemies of Christianity: they even praise our faith and honor the priests and saints of our Lord and help the churches and monasteries," and, again, "So long as God's gift [the consecration of bishops] has been and is transmitted canonically by the proper authorities, the world is full of bishops, priests, and believers, as many as the stars in heaven, and increasing from day to day."¹⁰

The Arabs of 'Irāq and Persia were, therefore, in daily touch with a vigorous Christianity, which had Syriac for its language, and which had carried on an active propaganda in Eastern Arabia itself, especially in the province of Baḥrayn, where bishoprics and monasteries had been established since early in the fifth century at the latest,¹¹ and many of them must also have had personal contact with Zoroastrians and Zoroastrianism. Moreover, the social organization of early Islām, and political and economic conditions in 'Irāq and the East, appear to have favored a speedier fusion of conqueror and conquered than has been imagined, not only in interests, but also in race, not to mention the fact that Aramaeans and Persians adopted Arabic names and became thus indistinguishable from Arabs. It is impossible to estimate now from the historical data at our command the degree of intermixture of the races by marriage or concubinage, but Lammens has pointed out how numerous Christian women must have been in Muslim harems, by marriage or by slavery,¹² and Persian women were probably no less acceptable. The records of clientships, however, and of the partisans of the various sects, afford an insight into the process of intermixture that was going on in the East astonishingly early in the Muslim era.

¹⁰ *Letters of the Patriarch Isho'-Yahbh III*, edited by R. Duval (*Corpus Scriptorum christianorum orientalium, Scriptores Syr*, series II, tom. 64, Paris, 1904-05), p. 251, ll. 13-19, p. 252, ll. 8-12.

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 281, and other letters to the bishops and monks of Baḥrayn. cf., Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale* (Paris, 1903), p. 285; E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of the Governors: Historia Monastica of Thomas, Bishop of Marga, A.D. 840* (edited from Syriac MSS., 2 vols. (London, 1893), Vol. I, p. 86; Vol. II, p. 188.

¹² *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth*, Vol. III (1908), p. 158.

Balādhurī, for example, tells us of four thousand Persians, named the Jund Shahānshāh, who begged for peace and became confederated with Zuhrah b. Ḥawīyyah al-Sa'dī of the Banū Tamīm and were later sent to Baṣra by Ziyād b. Abīhi and combined with the Asāwīrah.¹³ The Asāwīrah apparently were Persian cavalry who had joined the Arabs and become Muslims and allies of the Tamīm in Baṣra, and Balādhurī reports that although they were not present at the Battle of the Camel nor at Ṣiffīn, they took part in the Battle of Rabadhah in the days of Ibn Zubayr and also in the insurrection of Ibn al-Ash'ath.¹⁴ Balādhurī also mentions the Isbahānīs of Baṣra as compatriots of the Asāwīrah, and that the people of Qazwīn became clients of Zuhrah b. Ḥawīyyah of Kūfa, but this last notice seems to be a doublet of that upon the Jund Shahānshāh.¹⁵ However, that many Persians of the warrior class became affiliated with Arab tribes seems obvious, and it is worth observing that the Arab tribe with which they are said to have become allied is the Tamīm, who furnished so many leaders and adherents to the Khārijite cause.¹⁶

Significant also in this regard is the story of the rebellion of Khirrit b. Rashīd al-Nāji. Not himself a Khārijite, he yet rallied many Khārijites to his standard and also some 'Uthmānites, but the details of Ṭabarī's report show that his army contained besides a number of Christians, who had remained true to their faith, as well as others who had apostatized and become Muslims, but had lately returned to their original belief.¹⁷ Mas'ūdī pretends that all his partisans were apostates back to Christianity.¹⁸ Lammen observes that the story proves how numerous the Arabs were in the east of the peninsula who remained Christian,¹⁹ but what

¹³ Balādhurī, *Origins of the Islamic State*, Vol. I (Hitti), p. 440.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, pp. 91, 105-8.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 10 and 91.

¹⁶ Wellhausen, *Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, p. 9, n. 5; Brünnow, *op. cit.*, p. 8, n. 1.

¹⁷ *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed Ibn Djarir al-Tabari*, cum aliis edidit M. J. de Goeje, Bd. I-XIII, (Leiden, 1879-98). Part I, pp. 3434-7.

¹⁸ *Les Prairies d'Or*, C. Barbier de Meynard et Pavot de Courteille (Paris, 1861-1877), IV, p. 418.

¹⁹ *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de Beyrouth*, Vol. II (1907), Mo'āwiya, p. 25.

the story actually demonstrates is the fusion of parties in the East, where Khārijites and 'Uthmānites, Christians, renegade Christians, and tax-dodgers could find themselves arrayed under a common flag.

From various historical notices it also appears that the followers of the different Khārijite chiefs were in many cases a most motley crew. The partisans of Abū Maryam al-Sa'dī in A.D. 659 near Kūfa were freedmen and non-Arabs.²⁰ Those of 'Ubaydallah b. Māhūz, the Azraqite leader, were dyers, smiths, and ragamuffins—Mubarrad makes Muhallab b. Abī Ṣufra name them slaves²¹—non-Arabs, who only wished most probably in the beginning to shake off the yoke of their oppressors, but who became in the course of time the most fanatical of the fanatics and multiplied hydra-fashion.²² Mustawrid, when forced to flee from Kūfa, sought and found refuge in the Christian city of Hīra,²³ and when Ibn al-Ash'ath rebelled against al-Ḥajjāj, there flocked to his standard not only the Muslims of 'Irāq and the East, Shī'ites, 'Uthmānites, and Khārijites included, but also the Persians and Christians. For al-Ḥajjāj specifically charges the non-Arab landlords and the Christians of Najrānite origin near Kūfa with complicity in this revolt, and also fined the Christians for their part in it.²⁴

A consideration of the countries where Khārijitism flourished leads also to the conclusion that the ranks of the Khārijites were recruited from among the non-Arabs to a considerable extent. For the only Khārijite sect that appeared in northern Arabia were the Najadāt, and they were crushed in the days of 'Abd al-Malik, never to rise again, although one of their sub-sects, the 'Aṭawīya, went to Sijistān and prospered there,²⁵ and even Baṣra

²⁰ cf. *Ibn-el-Athuri Chronicon*, edidit Carolus Johannes Tornberg, Bd. I-XIV (Lugduni Batavorum, 1851-76), Bd. III, pp. 313-14.

²¹ *The Kāmil of El-Mubarrad*, edited by W. Wright (Leipzig, 1864 ff.), pp. 628-30.

²² *ibid.*, p. 680. Observe the kindly attitude of the Khārijites towards Christians and Jews; Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

²³ *Tabari*, edited by de Goeje, Part I, p. 3460; Part II, p. 235.

²⁴ Balādhuri, *Origins of the Islamic State*, Vol. I (Hitti), p. 104.

²⁵ The later Ibādite movement in South Arabia with Abū Ḥamza's capture of Mecca and al-Madīna in A.D. 747 was probably a purely Arab affair, but

and its government, the cradle of the Khārijite movement, was lost to the cause about the same time, wrenched from the grasp of the Azraqites by al-Ḥajjāj and his fabian general, Muhallab, who exterminated the Azraqites finally even in Kirmān, their stronghold and recruiting center.²⁶ Apart from southern Arabia and north and east Africa the chief breeding grounds of the sect seem to have been Kirmān, Sijistān, Khurāsān and Mesopotamia, with, although to a less degree, Fars and the Sawād, and in these regions, especially in Kirmān and Mesopotamia, it endured longest, outliving probably the 'Abbāsīd dynasty.

Ya'qūbī, for instance, informs us that Ya'qūb the Coppersmith waged a war of extermination against the Khārijites of Kirmān and Sīstān. Both Istakhrī and Ibn Khallikān, on the other hand, report that Ya'qūb was himself a Khārijite, and their story is quite credible. For, as Barthold points out, Ya'qūb used the Khārijite town of Bamm in Kirmān as a state prison, showing thereby apparently his confidence in its inhabitants, and there were Khārijites in plenty there later, as the notices of Ibn Rustah and Istakhrī about Khārijite cities prove.²⁷ Khārijitism was, therefore, a live issue in Sīstān and Kirmān in the tenth century and probably for a long time thereafter.

The most serious Khārijite rebellions, however, since the final defeat of the Azraqites, occurred in Mesopotamia, under al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Qais al-Shaybānī, in the Khalīfate of the last of the Umayyads, Marwān, and much later under Musāwir in the days of the 'Abbāsīd, Mu'tazz.²⁸ The first, as Wellhausen remarks, brought the Khārijites nearer to their objective than they had ever been. The second defied the government, such as it was, for a decade. Khārijites arose in revolt in the Khalīfate of Hārūn

south Arabia must be considered as a special region by itself because of the Persian, Christian and Jewish influences to which it was subjected. The establishment of Ibādītism in east and north Africa does not come within the purview of this essay. It is to be observed that the seat of the Najadāt was al-Yamāmah.

²⁶ See Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 35, n. 3.

²⁷ See W. Barthold, "Zur Geschichte der Saffariden," in *Orientalische Studien, Nöldeke-Festschrift* (Gieszen, 1906), Vol. I, p. 178 ff.

²⁸ *Tabarī*, edited by de Goeje, Part II, pp. 1897 ff.; Part III, pp. 1688 ff.

al-Rashīd in Khurāsān, in the Khalifate of Ma'mūn in Mesopotamia, and in the Sawād and in Khurāsān, during the short reign of Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī in Baghdād.²⁹ In these regions the movement did not die out, probably, much before the advent of the Tartars.

On p. 17 of his *Oppositionsparteien*, Wellhausen writes that "Von dem Boden der Schia, auf dem sie erwachsen waren, hatten sie sich [the Khārijites] dadurch gelöst, dass sie dem Ali zürnten, weil er die durch den Pakt mit den Syrern begangene Verleugnung des Glaubens . . . nicht durch sofortigen Bruch des Vertrages wieder gut machen wollte." This statement of Wellhausen is only valid when properly defined. It is true that the Khārijites belonged originally to the *shī'a* or party of 'Alī, but it is altogether erroneous to suppose that their beginnings go back to what is generally known as the Shī'a simply. And this obvious distinction must be made and discussed if only to correct the idea, based most probably on Shahrastānī, and widely prevalent, that the Khārijites were the natural opponents of the Shī'ites politically and theologically.³⁰

Wellhausen and Lammens have shown that for the 'Irāqians the cause of 'Alī was in the last analysis the cause of the province. They supported him, not because he was the son-in-law of the Prophet, but because he had made Kūfa the capital of the Muslim empire; and it is evident that the same motive dictated their proclamation, at 'Alī's death, of his son, Ḥasan, as Khalīfa, and later their invitation to Ḥasan's brother, Ḥusayn, to come to Kūfa and be acknowledged as such. These Bedouins, as Brünnow has called them, had as yet no conception of divine rights or of legitimate succession. Their will was the organ of election, as is proven by their whole-hearted espousal of the Khalifate of 'Abd al-Raḥ-

²⁹ *Chronique d'Abou Djafar Mohammed ben Djerrir ben Yezid Tabari*, traduite . . . par Herm. Zotenberg (Paris, 1867-74, Tom. I-IV), Vol. IV, pp. 460, 497, 512. *Tabari*, edited by de Goeje, Part III, pp. 121, 492, 1016. Al-Hajjāj did not definitely quell Khārijitism, therefore.

³⁰ This view goes back to al-Shahrastānī through Marracci's *Prodromus ad refutationem Alcorani* (Romae, 1691; edited by Wm. Cureton, London, 1842), Part III, p. 74; cf. al-Shahrastānī's definition of a Khārijite, pp. 85, 113 ff. It is a curious fact that Mukhtār's rebellion is labelled Khārijite in the Persian *Tabari* as well as Shī'ite. cf. Zotenberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 65 ff.

mān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath in the days of 'Abd al-Malik and al-Ḥajjāj, and of that of Yazīd b. Muḥallab under Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Malik.³¹ And quite as significant is the platform on which these two noble representatives of the two opposing Arab factions were recognized as Khalīfa, namely, that they should take the Book of God and the Traditions of the Prophet as their guide, repudiate the illegitimate Imāms, and carry on the Holy War.³² It is little wonder that Khārijites as well as 'Alids could flock to their standard.

Wellhausen's description of the partisans of the early 'Alid movements such as that of Ibn Ṣurad and Mukhtār as penitents is, however, substantially correct.³³ They were obeying an old Arab instinct, that of vengeance, and at the same time satisfying their consciences and pursuing political ambitions. The Saba'ite notion of the deity of 'Alī fell evidently on barren ground. Arab souls refused to entertain it.³⁴ And Mukhtār's proclamation of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya as Mahdī shows how little progress the idea of the House of the Prophet had made in the hearts of the 'Irāqians. There is little or no evidence of Shī'itism, as we think of it, before the revolt of Zaid b. 'Alī b. Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib in the Khalīfate of Hishām.³⁵ Such sects as the Kaisānites and the Saba'ites were of little or no importance. Their very existence is even dubious. For the Kaisānites are described as a subsect of the Zaidites,³⁶ which is altogether strange, and, as Friedlaender observes, the Jewish origin of 'Abdullah b. Saba sufficiently explains the endeavors of Muḥammadan theologians to charge him with many a heresy which developed in the later course of Shī'itism, not to mention the creation of a sect named after him.³⁷

³¹ *Tabari*, edited by de Goeje, Part II, pp. 1055 ff., 1391 ff.

³² *Tabari*, edited by Zotenberg, Vol. IV, pp. 131, 257; cf. also Vol. IV, p. 1; *Tabari*, edited by de Goeje, Part II, p. 1058.

³³ Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 71 ff.

³⁴ cf. the Khalīfa 'Alī's rejection as given in al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bain al-Firāq* (Cairo, 1910), p. 15.

³⁵ *Tabari*, edited by Zotenberg, Vol. IV, p. 302. Observe the terms of Zaid's letter.

³⁶ Al-Baghdādī, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

³⁷ "The Heterodoxies of the Shī'ites," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXIX (1908), p. 19; cf. *ibid.*, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 6 ff.

In its formative period the Khārijite sect was never actually in opposition politically or theologically to either the early 'Alid parties or the later Shī'ite movements. After the death of 'Alī, whenever his partisans fought against the Khārijites, they did so, not as 'Alids, but at the behest of Umayyad governors and generals, and for the most part grudgingly, unwilling to march beyond the boundaries of their own province, and more often we find 'Alids and Khārijites uniting together against the common enemy, the House of the Curse, the Umayyads.³⁸

The theological opposition of the two sects is a legacy to European scholarship from the generalizations of Muslim historians. Western scholars have rejected Ibn Ḥazm's notion that the sects were the revenge taken by the Persians on their Arab conquerors, an idea worth interpreting, but they have never freed themselves from the classifications of the Muslim historians of religion. Ibn Ḥazm's dictum that Islām is divided into four sects, the Mu'tazilites, Murjites, Khārijites, and Shī'ites, the two former representing the dogmatic side, the two latter the political side of Islām, still holds the field, and by its classificatory opposition of the two latter sects in the doctrine of the Imāmate, not only gives a false emphasis to that doctrine, but also leads to erroneous conclusions as to the development of Khārijite thought.³⁹

The formative period of Khārijitism is the period of the development and organization of Muslim traditions (*ḥadīth*) and law (*fiqh*), and that is what gives it its peculiar character, and not any opposition between it and Shī'itism or Murjitism. For although the political history of the Khārijites consists in a series of rebellions against constituted authority, where the question of the Imāmate appears the exclusive issue, their inner religious history falls into a series of excommunications, where the main subjects in dispute are the qualifications of a Muslim and the attitude which he ought to take towards non-Muslims, including, of course, members of all other Muslim sects.⁴⁰

³⁸ cf. the relations between Ibn Šurad of al-Kūfa and Nāfi' b. al-Azraq, *Tabarī*, edited by Zotenberg, Vol. IV, p. 76.

³⁹ Al-Khayyāt gives the same classification in his *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*, edited by H. S. Nyberg (Cairo, 1925), p. 136.

⁴⁰ cf. al-Khayyāt, *op. cit.*, p. 68 foot. The comparison of Khārijites with

In the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* it is maintained that the importance of the Khārijites "lies particularly, from the point of view of the development of dogma, in the formulation of questions related to the theory of the Khalifate and to justification by faith or works." This statement is a fair résumé of the opinions of modern scholars,⁴¹ but it does not indicate the inner spirit of Khārijitism, nor allow for its development. Justification by faith or works was a very live question in early Islām, as al-Bukhārī's chapter on Faith demonstrates, just as it was in early Christianity, and the Khārijites discussed it, and for the most part maintained that works are a necessary part of religion, although the Mukarramites seem to have been able to combine with such a view a doctrine comparable with that of the Calvinists on Election.⁴² But this is not the only, nor even the main question that was disputed in Khārijite circles, and when the true relations of Khārijitism, Shī'itism, and Mu'tazilitism are recognized, the share of the Khārijites in the development of such doctrines as those of Free Will, Revelation, and the Nature and Attributes of God, will become apparent, but more especially their contribution to the social and legal conceptions of Islām. For the early Khārijite thinkers were men of law (*fiqh*) rather than of theology (*kalām*), and their minds were concentrated on defining with concrete cases what it was to be a Muslim, and what a Muslim's relations must be with his fellow men, Muslim and non-Muslim, rather than on inquiring into the nature of faith and works and their relation to religion, or the mysteries of revelation and of the nature and attributes of God, although in the process of time these questions arose and were developed in Khārijite sects.

Thus Nāfi' b. al-Azraq raised the issue whether the Qa'ada, those who stayed at home and abstained from going forth to war (i.e. with the Khārijites), were believers or unbelievers, which

the Puritans is misleading: Brünnow, *op. cit.*, p. 27; Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (Heidelberg, 1910), p. 205; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

⁴¹ cf. Goldziher, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-8.

⁴² *Al-Ash'arī: Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam*, herausgegeben von H. Ritter (Istanbul, 1929), Vol. I, p. 100, ll. 7-13; al-Shahrastānī, *op. cit.*, p. 97, col. 2, l. 10.

must have been a very vital question in early Islām with its doctrine of the Holy War. The Azraqites declared them unbelievers, and considered it lawful to slay or enslave them and take their property. The Najadāt held that their abstention was permissible, but that to go forth to war was more excellent. The Ṣufrites did not judge them to be unbelievers, if they agreed with them. And the Ibādites did not punish them, if they were People of the Qibla and unitarians.⁴³

The discussion of this question of the Qa'ada (abstainers) was linked with that of Taqiyya (dissimulation), that peculiarly Shī'ite doctrine! For it was important to establish the correct attitude to take towards those who agreed with them, but who remained in non-Khārijite territory concealing their true faith. The Azraqites held that Taqiyya was illegal in word and act. The Najadāt declared that it was sanctioned both in word and act. The Ṣufrites maintained that it was permitted in word, but not in act. And some Ibādites said that it was polytheism, others that it was unbelief (*kufr*), and still others reserved judgment upon this matter.⁴⁴ The subject was evidently earnestly debated, as the discussion of minor details proves, and its appearance so early in the history of Khārijitism throws an interesting light upon the question of Khārijite-Shī'ite relations, which would bear investigation, for friendships between Shī'ites and Khārijites are recorded.⁴⁵ And in this regard it is of the utmost importance to observe that the question was for the early Khārijites a very practical one, dictated to them by their experience, a matter of their daily relations with their fellows which had to be regulated.

Their relations with non-Khārijite Muslims was also a problem. The 'Aufites declared that if an Imām be an unbeliever (i.e. a non-Khārijite), his subjects are also unbelievers, whether they be in secret Khārijites or not. A small party of the Bayhasites also subscribed to this belief, and considered it lawful to kill and en-

⁴³ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 86-7, 89-91, 93, 97, 109; al-Shahrastānī, *op. cit.*, pp. 90, 93, 102.

⁴⁴ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, p. 105; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 92, 93, 102; *cf.* 101.

⁴⁵ *cf.* Friedlaender, "Heterodoxies," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXIX (1909), p. 10.

slave and plunder the People of the Qibla in every circumstance. For the Ibādites, however, Muslim territory not under Khārijite control was still Muslim territory, except the army of the sultan, which was heathen territory, and they disapproved of the slaying of those who disagreed with them until they had been openly summoned to adopt their faith and had refused. The Ḥusaynites, on the other hand, considered the "House of Islam" a "House of War," but held that it was illegal to advance against it until after it had been put to the test. Some of the Ḍaḥḥākites accepted non-Khārijite Muslims who lived among them as believers, others rejected them, except in the case of those whose belief they knew of, still others reserved judgment about them.⁴⁶

The legal spirit dominating all this discussion will be apparent, and the same spirit runs through a great section of Khārijite thought. Is the killing of the wives and children of unbelievers legal? Are the children of believers and unbelievers believers or unbelievers, or neither believers nor unbelievers? Do they go to heaven or hell? Should they be regarded as friends or enemies?⁴⁷ Is it legal to inherit from non-Khārijites or to marry non-Khārijite women?⁴⁸ Should slaves pay or receive alms from the tithes? What tithes should be paid?⁴⁹ Should you pray behind one whom you do not know? How many *rak'as* constitute prayer?⁵⁰ *What* kind of evidence is valid?⁵¹ Is the protection of unbelievers obligatory or not? And where is it not obligatory?⁵² Can property be legally claimed as booty, while the owner is still alive?⁵³ Is ignorance an excuse for error? Is independent judgment (*ijtihād*) allowable?⁵⁴ For a parallel to the Khārijite discussion of these and

⁴⁶ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 104, 111, 115, 116, 118; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 96, 98, 100.

⁴⁷ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 89, 92, 96, 100, 115, 125-6; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 90, 94-6, 98, 101.

⁴⁸ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 104, 111-12, 121, 126; al-Shahrastānī, p. 102.

⁴⁹ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 98, 99-100; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 98, 102.

⁵⁰ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 116, 126.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 117; al-Shahrastānī, p. 100.

⁵² *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 89, 91; al-Shahrastānī, p. 91.

⁵³ al-Shahrastānī, p. 95.

⁵⁴ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 90, 108, 126; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 91-2, 97, col. 2.

such like questions one need only go to the great collections of Traditions and there find not only the subjects, but likewise other answers in a like vein. For this type of Khārijite thought and the Traditions grew up together.

There is another side, however, to Khārijite speculation, probably a later development, which nevertheless need not be considered, as has been done, merely the result of Mu'tazilite influence, since a considerable number of Khārijite sects are reported to have pursued such speculation. Goldziher, Motylinski, and Nallino have pointed out the correspondence between Ibādite doctrines and those of the Mu'tazilites,⁵⁵ but it is clear from the spread of such doctrines over eastern Khārijitism, and from the nature of the debate about them, that these questions agitated Khārijite circles fairly early; and it is no more necessary to suppose that the Khārijites borrowed these ideas from the Mu'tazilites than to maintain that they received the idea of Taqiyya (dissimulation) from the Shī'ites. The questions and answers pertaining to these doctrines may have arisen naturally out of their attempt to define the duty of a Muslim to other Muslims and to non-Muslims, which was the Khārijite issue *par excellence*.

Najda's position that independent judgment (*ijtihād*) is permitted and that ignorance may excuse error⁵⁶ involved the question of how much a Muslim ought to know in order to be considered a true Muslim. Is it enough, as the Shubaybites and others maintained, that a man testify that there is no God but Allāh and that Muḥammad is His prophet, and that he accept the saints of God (the Khārijites) and repudiate His enemies, and acknowledge all that has come from God (the prescriptions of the Qur'ān), and need he not know the other laws imposed by God (in the Traditions)? Or, with Ibn Bayhas, ought he to know these, since faith is to know, being knowledge with the heart and

⁵⁵ Goldziher, in *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, Vol. LII (1905), pp. 232 ff.; Nallino, *Rivista degli studi orientali*, Vol. VII¹ (1910), pp. 455-60; see Motylinski, *Guerara depuis sa fondation* (Algiers, 1885).

⁵⁶ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, p. 90; al-Shahrastānī, p. 91.

not just confession and works?⁵⁷ It is in part a conflict over the acceptance or rejection of the Traditions,⁵⁸ showing how closely related the development of Khārijitism was with that of the Traditions, but it is also the beginning of speculation over the nature of revelation and of man and God.

There is, for instance, a curious story told by al-Ash'arī about the Najadāt, the implication of which seems to be that they felt that the Imām should be infallible, a belief which is quite consistent with another Khārijite idea, that the test of revelation is the character of the messenger, and also with the fact that they did not approve of obligatory laws for peoples unless prophets had been sent to them.⁵⁹ The Bayhasite position, on the other hand, that God cannot conceal His judgments of their sins from men,⁶⁰ would probably bring up the question of the nature of God and of man's knowledge of God, and the Khārijite insistence on works as a necessary part of faith must have led them inevitably to the question of free will.

From their belief concerning works it might be presumed that the Khārijites would have adopted the doctrine of free will, but, as a matter of fact, the sects are fairly evenly divided between its acceptance and its rejection. The Maymūnites, Ḥamzites, Ma'lūmites, Wāqīfites, the Followers of the Question, and the Aṭrāfites accepted the doctrine, the 'Ajāridah, Khalafites, Shu'aybites, Khāzimites, Majhūlites, Shaybanites, and most of the Bayhasites rejected it.⁶¹ According to Shahrastānī, the Ibādite position is practically that of al-Ash'arī.⁶² For he says that the Ibādites hold that the acts of the creature are created by God, but acquired by the creature, which seems also to be the position of the Shu'ayb-

⁵⁷ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 113-15; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 93-4.

⁵⁸ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, p. 127. The Azraqites held only by the external sense (*zāhir*) of the Qur'ān.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 91-2, 106, 127. *cf.* the debate on whether a prophet requires a sign or not, p. 106.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 116.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 93-4, 96, 116, 127; al-Shahrastānī, pp. 96-7, 99.

⁶² *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, p. 100. According to al-Ash'arī all the Ibādite sects except that which was known by the name, Ibādite, rejected it; pp. 104, 108.

ites in Shahrastānī,⁶³ facts which point to a further development of the Khārijite doctrine after al-Ash'arī's time. Al-Ash'arī also reports that all the Khārijites denied God the power to do evil. Shahrastānī, however, limits this belief to the Maymūnites.⁶⁴

In the face of this diversity of opinion concerning free will, it is rather puzzling to find al-Ash'arī declaring that all the Khārijites maintained the createdness of the Qur'ān⁶⁵ and also, with the exception of the Ibādites, the Mu'tazilite doctrine of the unity of God.⁶⁶ The Ibādites followed Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir in this doctrine, and held that God does not cease to be a Willer of the objects of knowledge which are, that they continue to be, and of the objects of knowledge which are not, that they continue not to be.⁶⁷ The only inference that can be drawn is that Khārijite doctrine, with the exceptions already noticed, received its final formulation around the beginning of the ninth century during the hegemony of the Mu'tazilites. Further evidence of this may be the fact that Yazīd b. 'Abd al-Rahmān, the Shaybanite, follows the doctrine of Hishām b. al-Hakam, that God did not know until He created knowledge for Himself.⁶⁸ The curious Khārijite idea that friendship and enmity are two attributes of the essence may be a still earlier development, with its basis in the primitive Khārijite discussion of their relations to other Muslims.⁶⁹ It may, however, have been due to Zoroastrian influence.⁷⁰

In conclusion it may be permitted to point out the bearing of this paper on the question of the Ibādites in north Africa and their Mu'tazilite ideas. For if, as is here maintained, Khārijite doc-

⁶³ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, p. 97.

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 124; al-Shahrastānī, p. 96.

⁶⁵ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 108, 124.

⁶⁶ *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 124.

⁶⁷ *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 124.

⁶⁸ al-Shahrastānī, p. 99.

⁶⁹ *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, pp. 96-7.

⁷⁰ *cf.* the fact which al-Karābīsī mentions that the 'Ajāridah and Maymūna maintain the legality of marriages with sons' daughters and daughters' daughters and brothers' daughters' daughters and brothers' sons' daughters, but say that God has forbidden daughters and brothers' and sisters' daughters. That is, marriage is permitted outside those relationships specifically given in the Qur'ān. *Al-Ash'arī*, Vol. I, p. 95; al-Shahrastānī, p. 96.

trines were developed early and, with some exceptions, received their final formulation in the ninth century, it is altogether probable that north African Ibāḍitism inherited its doctrines from the East.⁷¹

⁷¹ cf. Nallino, *Rivista degli studi orientali*, Vol. VII¹ (1916), pp. 455-60.

MURRAY T. TITUS

*Superintendent of Moradabad District,
North India Conference, Methodist Episcopal
Church, Moradabad, India*

ISLĀM AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD¹

¹ Originally presented as a lecture at Dr. E. Stanley Jones' Ashram, Sat Tal, India, and reprinted in *The Message of Sat Tal Ashram*, 1932, Y.M.C.A. Press, Calcutta, India.

ISLĀM AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD

By MURRAY T. TITUS

ISLĀM does not employ the phrase "the kingdom of God." Muḥammad does not seem to have been acquainted with it—or if he was, either he did not grasp its significance, or it did not appeal to him. However that may be, there is indeed sufficient similarity between the term as employed by the Jews, and the outstanding features of Islām as a religious, social, and political entity to warrant a study of the religion of the Arabian Prophet from this point of view.

Though the term is not found in the Qur'ān, there are most certainly passages that suggest it. For instance "Allāh's is *the kingdom of the heavens and the earth*" (ii: 107); "blessed is He in whose hand is the kingdom" (lxvii: 1). Curiously enough this sixty-seventh sūra is entitled "The Kingdom" (*al-Mulk*). But the commentators find nothing unusual in this to attract their attention. It is only when we come to a modern commentator, Maulvi Muḥammad 'Ali of Lahore, that we find a characteristic Aḥmadi attempt to place the full weight of the Christian meaning upon it. He declares that this first verse of the sixty-seventh sūra undoubtedly refers to the kingdom of God as classically used, and goes on to state "that that kingdom . . . was now about to be established on earth." That is, Allāh was now actually setting up through Muḥammad "the kingdom of Islām, *which was really the kingdom of God.*" And further, according to this authority, there is all the more reason for thinking that Islām was to be and is the fulfilment of God's purpose in this respect, when taking into consideration the saying of Christ found in Matthew xxi: 43, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you [the Jews], and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."¹

¹ *The Holy Qur'ān*, translated by Muḥammad 'Ali, Lahore, 1920, p. 1096.

Now while we cannot admit the validity of such twisting of meanings as our Ahmadi scholar has seen fit to employ, nevertheless in Islām we are confronted with a system which, in theory at any rate, seeks to achieve the establishment on earth of a certain form of theocracy, or kingdom of God. Therefore, there is a measurable amount of similarity between this ideal of Islām and the conception of the ancient Jewish State which is worthy of study. The parallel, however, between the Islāmic conception of the kingdom of God, and that of Christ is not so evident—Maulvi Muḥammad ‘Alī to the contrary notwithstanding. We now turn to a detailed consideration of Islām viewed as “the kingdom of God.”

1. *The Islāmic conception of the State.* In his brilliant treatise on *Ijtihad*, Sir Muḥammad Iqbal elaborates the view that Islām is not merely a religion, but a complete system ordained of God for the political, social, moral, and spiritual governance of mankind. It is not a state religion but a *religious State*, of which Allāh is the real ruler. This conception was part and parcel of Muḥammad’s message and practice, especially after he reached al-Madīna. In this message Allāh as the supreme ruler of mankind stands out above all else, and next to it is the declaration that mankind depends for salvation on the guidance which Allāh communicates through His prophet and apostle Muḥammad. The prophet was therefore under a divine mandate to set up a state, the real ruler of which was Allāh. Thus the kingdom of Allāh was set up first of all in al-Madīna, and as laws were needed, they were regularly forthcoming direct from Allāh himself through the medium of special revelations which were given from time to time to Muḥammad. The Qur’ān, therefore, became the first and foremost statute book of the Islāmic State, and so it remains to this day.

It is generally recognized that the Semitic peoples had from the most ancient times adopted the practice of regarding a special deity as the real ruler of the tribe. This henotheistic practice reached its highest and most persistent form in Jehovah, the national God of the Jews, and later this passed over into a conception of deity which made Jehovah the one and only God of the

universe. Nevertheless in the beginning, and virtually to the time of Christ, the phrase the kingdom of God was uniformly understood to mean the temporal kingdom of the Jewish people, whose real ruler was Jehovah—God. It was such a kingdom as this, for the Jews only, which the captives in Babylon longed to see re-established in Jerusalem. Now a very interesting thing is that while in developing his ideas of the religious State which he was setting up, Muḥammad, though a member of a Semitic tribe, and though he used an appellation of deity which was peculiar to the Arabs, nevertheless gave to Allāh a *universal* significance, and to His rule world-wide implications which made Islām a universal religion from the start. The Islāmic conception of the kingdom of God is thus much broader than that of the Jews. The latter was for one nation only—if we overlook certain of the later teachings—whereas Islām was a kingdom for all mankind, as Allāh was the ruler of all men.

Now this world outlook of Muḥammad is very significant, and no doubt had a very direct bearing on the future spread and development of Islām as a religion and culture among the nations of the world. But the ideal Muslim State was never realized in its fulness, except in al-Madīna, and during the lifetime of the Prophet himself. For he alone was in direct contact with Allāh. Even so we find no completed code which he left, which was adequate for any and all circumstances for all time to come. Even the Qur'ān, sacred as it is, has had to be supplemented by endless traditions from the Prophet to cover all phases and detailed circumstances of life. And even yet all life has not been provided for. Indeed it is reported that "one of the greatest legists of Islām never ate a watermelon because he could not find that the usage of the Prophet had laid down and sanctioned a canonical method for doing so."²

At his death Muḥammad left no program for the continuation of the religious State which he had founded at the command of Allāh. The Qur'ān—the revealed word of Allāh—was silent on the point. Nevertheless the Muslim people faced the issue with

² D. B. Macdonald, *Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, p. 67.

a determination and conviction which ultimately produced a solution satisfactory to the great majority of the Faithful. This solution was found in the election of the Khalīfa or successor of the Prophet. It is worth noting that this temporal ruler of the Muslims was not called King—for Allāh was in truth their king. As Muḥammad had ruled them as Prophet and Apostle of Allāh, but did not assume the title king (*malik*), which in theory at least belonged to Allāh alone, therefore they avoided the use of the term in the line of successors of the Prophet by using the term Khalīfa. In later times, and in countries subordinate, even though nominally, to the Khalīfa, the rulers have almost without exception been designated as *sultans*, which term does not connote the same independent supremacy as the word *malik*, which was invariably laden with divine significance. Under this new arrangement where the Khalīfa was the supreme ruler of the Muslims throughout the world, he was regarded theoretically as occupying his position of eminence in accordance with the will of Allāh as expressed in the election of the Muslim people, as in the case of the first four "rightly guided Khalīfas," or in later times by *de facto* occupation of this exalted post. The Khalīfa was thus regarded as "the shadow of God." And Muslim sultans of utterly independent kingdoms, whose power exceeded even that of the Khalīfa himself have, at times, like the Mughal emperors of India, sought the nominal approval and investiture of power from a weak representative of God on earth in order to keep up the legal fiction of the overlordship of the Khalīfa and the supremacy of Allāh as the real king of the Faithful in particular, and of all men in general.

In summary then we may say that the Islāmic ideal holds that human society should be so organized as to acknowledge Allāh as its supreme ruler; that there should be on earth one supreme representative of Allāh, the Khalīfa, acknowledged by all subordinate sultans as their overlord; that there should be one body of Divine Law—the sacred Shari'at—based on the Qur'ān, Traditions, analogical deductions of the great mujtahids, and the Agreement of the learned from age to age for the regulation of all the affairs of men both human and divine.

But unfortunately the Muslim peoples have been doomed to almost as bitter disappointment in the matter of the realization of this ideal on a large scale as the Jewish people were in the development of their theocracy. At the most we can say that they achieved a measure of success through the period of the first four Khalīfas: Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman, and 'Ali. The Muslim armies fought and died in the way of Allāh from east to west, and extended Muslim rule with unprecedented swiftness and success. But with the extension of rule and territory situations arose which all but destroyed in practice the theocratic idea of the Muslim State, which had originally been set up. The Umayyad and 'Abbasid Khalīfates in Damascus and Baghdad, with all their luxury and worldly power, reflected little of the intense religious fervor of the early stages of the Muslim State. They were great political entities. And what is worse, after the 'Abbasids passed off the stage, we find rival Khalīfas setting themselves up and seeking the allegiance of the Muslim world. Finally, in 1924, the last of these shadowy Khalīfas was bowed off the stage in quite unceremonious fashion by the new Turkish Republic, while the rest of the Muslim world stood aghast. Even the symbol of the vice-regent of God on earth has disappeared . . . and Islām may never have another.

As a result of all these turmoils and disappointments in the development of the ideal Islāmic State as a world-wide institution Islām has suffered a disappointment which is quite a parallel to that suffered by the Jews after their return from the Babylonian Captivity which we observed in the first section. And just as the Jews did not in their disappointment give up in utter despair, but maintained an inextinguishable hope that the Messiah would still come and restore the kingdom to Israel, so there has grown up in Islām a widespread popular, though largely unorthodox, belief in the coming of the Mahdi, who will ultimately inaugurate a universal kingdom of Islām upon the earth.

2. *The doctrine of the Mahdi and the second coming of Christ.* There is a great similarity between the Muslim belief in the coming of the Mahdi and his functions as a universal ruler and restorer of Muslim rule, and the premillennial doctrine of the second

either by their own rulers or by non-Muslims, the more fervent has been their longing for this ultimate restorer of the true Islām and the conqueror of the whole world for Islām. And as the need of a Mahdi has been felt, the Mahdis have always appeared, and Islām has arisen sword in hand, under their banner."

While Mahdis have appeared from time to time announcing the swift and sure approach of the end of the world, for the most part they have played a larger part in the imagination of the Muslim peoples than they have on the stage of human history. There was a very vigorous Mahdi movement in India in the sixteenth century, at the beginning of the century preceding the first millennium of Islām. Several such Mahdis arose, and a Mahdawi sect arose which believes that since the Mahdi has already come, there is no need to look for another. The most famous Mahdi of modern times was the Mahdi of the Sudan, whose uprising resulted in the death of that gallant Christian, General Gordon, at Khartoum. The Mahdi of the Sanusi brotherhood of northern Africa also obtained great fame and influence in the latter part of the nineteenth century. But the most interesting Mahdist development of all is to be found in India in the person of Mirza Ghulam Aḥmad, founder of the Aḥmadiyya community at Qadian in the Punjab. He declared himself to be a combination of the Mahdi of the Muslims, the Messiah of the Christians in his second coming, and the tenth or Nishkalank Avatar (Sinless Incarnation) of Vishnu, expected by the Hindus. Thus in himself he declared a realization and fulfilment of the hopes of all three communities. His sect is a live and growing organization in India, with branches throughout the world, carrying on a world-wide Islāmic missionary propaganda. But in these latter days his Mahdi character is largely submerged, and he is chiefly regarded as one of the periodical renewers (*mujaddid*) of the true Faith of Islām.

3. *The Laws of the Islāmic Kingdom of God.* We have already observed that the Jewish and Islāmic systems agree in their fundamental assumption that it is God himself who in the first instance, at any rate, is the actual lawgiver of His people. The Jews go back to Sinai and the twelve tables given there by Jehovah to Moses. The Muslims point to the Qur'ān as the very words of Allāh which

were *given* to Muḥammad. For both peoples these divine statute books became the original law codes. True they could not stop there, for the changing circumstances of life made development of law inevitable. Among the Jews the priestly class developed the *Torah*; and among Muslims the learned theologians, *Mujtahids* and *Ulama*, were responsible for a similar development which is called the *Shari'at*. In both cases, too, the law in its entirety, even including this secondary development, was regarded as the expression of the holy will of God. With this conception of law for the guidance of man in all his relations as coming ultimately from God, it therefore became incumbent on those responsible for the Muslim community after Muḥammad to see that nothing was included in the *Shari'at* which was contrary to the *Qur'ān* and the Traditions, which have come to form the "constitution," as it were, of the Muslim State and Muslim society as well. Further, it was equally incumbent on them to see that all Muslim life was guided and guarded by legal prescriptions, so that there might be unity and harmony within.

We see now how vast is the difference between the Muslim conception of law as the expression of divine guidance, and the Christian conception of the laws of the kingdom of God as set forth by Jesus Christ in the Gospels. The one defines and prescribes in detail all that a man shall believe and do, specifying suitable rewards for right belief and conduct, and appropriate punishments for unbelief and disobedience. The other proclaims broad fundamental principles of belief and action which are as wide as life itself, and which provide light and guidance for the fullest development of human life in all its aspects. Christ was certainly as much interested in the political, social, and spiritual life of man as Muḥammad was. But his conception of legislation for the kingdom was vastly different. He appealed to the broad vision and deep insights of man to work out his own salvation. Muḥammad laid down rigid rules of action, not only to guide but also to bind men both in belief and action. He secured uniformity and obedience—but crushed initiative and the spirit of creativity. Turkey alone of all the Muslim nations so far has had the courage to assert its inborn creative impulse, and break the

shackles of the past. May not this fundamental rigidity explain in part, at least, why for centuries there have not been any truly great Muslim minds which have made outstanding contributions to world knowledge and culture. Where are the modern Muslim scientists, theologians, poets or philosophers who attract world-wide attention today?

However, it must not be supposed that Muslim law is utterly devoid of idealism and inspiration. To adopt such a view would be entirely beside the point. But to say that Islāmic law suffers from serious limitations is not to write it down as all bad by any means. In fact there are many respects in which the Muslims put the Christians to shame. Yet I think it is only fair to say that while Islām does have a principle of development and enlargement known as *Qiyas* (analogical reasoning) which coupled with *Ijma'* (agreement) makes possible a steady growth and development of Islāmic theology and law—nevertheless the natural conservatism of human nature has operated all too freely in preventing such changes, and in forbidding the free excursioning of the human mind and will. Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khan, Sir Muḥammad Iqbal, and Professor S. Khuda Bakhsh of India, not to mention Professor Taha Ḥusain of Cairo, have asserted this belief in the freedom of the Islāmic spirit—but as the world has seen both in the case of Sir Sayyid Aḥmad Khan, and especially in the case of Professor Taha Ḥusain, Muslim public opinion deals ruthlessly with those whom it suspects of going too far—beyond the bounds set by Allāh. The foregoing brief survey of Islāmic legal principles is sufficient to show both the strength and weakness of this great system. It leans too hard on *Law*, and too little on *Life*. It prefers to trust a static conception of Revelation, rather than an expanding and abundant Life which flows from Him, to know whom is Life eternal.

Islām presents a system which seeks to challenge the kingdom of God as proclaimed by Christ, and is out to win the world. It professes to be superior to Christianity both in principles and in practical achievement. It claims to offer a complete solution for the ills of this troubled world—a world brought to its present plight largely by so-called Christian peoples (be it said with

shame), who have failed either to comprehend fully or accept the principles of Christ.

But is the so-called *failure* of Christianity to be taken as a sufficient reason for abandoning Christ's conception of the kingdom of God for that of Islām? Does the future reconstruction and salvation of humanity really lie with the religion of the Prophet of Arabia? Can we take those seriously who say "Islām is the hope of the world?" The answer is to be found in a careful comparison of the messages of Muḥammad and Christ. We can trust the essential honesty of humanity to give the right answer, and to follow Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

JOHN M. TROUT
*Minster of the Federated
Church, Sandwich, Massachusetts*

A STUDY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF
CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ETHICS—WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO THE PERIOD OF
THE REFORMATION

A STUDY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ETHICS—WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION

By JOHN M. TROUT

I

IN ONE of his recent works,¹ the distinguished Spanish scholar, José Ortega y Gasset, splits humanity into two main classes, those who make great demands upon themselves, and others who demand nothing special of themselves, but for whom to live means to be every moment what they are without imposing upon themselves any efforts toward perfection.

As Señor Ortega goes on to suggest, this is no new classification. Indeed, for centuries it has been entirely familiar in orthodox Buddhism as the distinction between *Mahayana* and *Hinayana*, the Great Vehicle or Great Path over against the Lesser Vehicle or Lesser Path.

If not pressed too closely some such distinction is useful for making a way through mazes of conflicting ideas and practices that make up the vast body of material which constitutes the social teachings of the Christian churches.

Certainly the quest for moral and social perfection has not been absent. And no account of Christian ethical phenomena is satisfactory which does not consider the serious demands which Christians in all centuries have made upon themselves, especially in those smaller groups which under the most adverse conditions and without reference either to numbers or recognition have urged an uncompromising practice of the Golden Rule, as did the early Christians, or refusal to bear arms in a world so organized that war is one of the presuppositions of its existence, as did the Quakers in later centuries.

¹ *La Rebelión de las Masas*, translated under the title, *The Revolt of the Masses*, 1932.

But this fascinating and refreshing story of the sects is not the history of Christian ethics. Because, quite generally at the turning points in successive historic eras, when brought face to face with things as they are in the world, the Church has found some way in which to get on successfully without any conscious departure from what it believed to be the demands of the gospel that it proclaimed.

The history of Christian ethics is the record of skilful adaptations or compromises, noble or ignoble, whereby Christians have managed to make great demands upon themselves theoretically and at the same time in the management of public affairs and in the conduct of public and private business to follow the Lesser Path.

Both the great ethical systems developed within Christendom, the one under the guidance of the medieval Church, the other under the stimulation of the Reformation and Protestantism, are resultants of the interaction between powerful social forces at work in the ages when these systems arose, and the Christian tradition represented in literature and the convictions of powerful leaders or sects. And there is every reason to believe that any new systems which may develop in the future will arise in the same way. Some of the leading stages in these developments it is the purpose of this paper to indicate, necessarily in outline and somewhat meagerly.

II

As has been pointed out repeatedly² the earliest Christian movement developed almost entirely out of inward religious impulses and did not greatly concern itself about conditions in the world at large. Certainly any attempt to reform the world in the sense in which this is understood in modern times is remote from its genius. This attitude of practical indifference was inevitable for very obvious reasons. The Roman Empire was too powerful and the Christian movement was too remote and too feeble to make any direct impression upon social evils that were imbedded in local

² Strikingly and comprehensively by Paul Wendland in *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, 1912, especially pp. 247 ff.

administrations or imperial policies. Furthermore, early Christians lived in expectation that the existing order of things was shortly to be swept away by cataclysmic supernatural powers. Consequently, while living in the world they taught themselves to remain indifferent to it.

Hence we find the earliest Christian ethic emerging out of the group relations among those who called themselves followers of Jesus. The considerable body of ethical teachings that we find in the writings of Paul are almost entirely of this character, and it is a question how far Paul himself considered the applications beyond these groups of what he said about marriage relations or industry or general conduct of life. Within the groups these demands were indeed exalted and exacting, amounting to nothing short of what has been called a Love-Communism.³ Their indirect influence was powerful and far reaching, as evidenced by a somewhat widespread comment upon the conduct of Christians presupposed by the apologists of the second century. What we wish to indicate here is the fact that these ideals and regulations grew up without any conscious relation to the problems and needs of society at large. In its origins Christianity was primarily a religious movement with necessary social and economic reactions upon those who accepted it, not in any sense a social movement, designed to make the present world better or happier. If Jesus was not positively hostile to the world, as were so many of his followers when asceticism and monasticism began to develop, he lived his life largely unconscious of it or indifferent to it.

Wider contacts were, however, inevitable, and produced even more pronounced changes in moral and social attitudes than in theological outlook.

As expectation of a Day of the Lord receded, interest in the present world, and desire for more tolerable conditions for carrying on the conduct of life at home and in the market place, tended to increase; while the rapid spread of Christianity around the Mediterranean,⁴ mainly in cities, involved new cultural relations.

³ Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, 1931 (translation), Vol. I, pp. 58 ff.

⁴ Compare Harnack, *Die Entstehung und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, *passim*.

Christianity could not escape the ethical influence of contemporary Stoicism any more than its theology could remain apart from the influence of Platonism and other current philosophies. On the contrary, these relations were cultivated by apologists who by establishing contacts with current thinking sought to make the life of the Christians more tolerable and at the same time to commend Christianity as a way of life to their pagan neighbors. Analogies between the Golden Age and man's primitive state as taught by Greek and Roman writers and the Eden of Scripture were easy and alluring. Moreover, the Christian law as contained in the Decalogue was discovered to have affinities with the law of nature, dwelt upon so constantly by the Stoics. Out of these contacts came most of the terminology which plays such a part in the literature of the Middle Ages in both theology and ethics. Efforts to live in the world and to win the world opened ways for entirely new attitudes toward moral evil as it existed in the world and toward the State,⁵ as compared with the attitude of comparative indifference or hostility that characterized Christian beginnings.

All these influences and others of equal importance not mentioned prepared the way for the great transition by which in the course of a few centuries the Church, from being an insignificant sect, came to the place where it was in position through so-called Christian emperors and powerful bishops to lay down ethical rules for an empire and to elaborate the theories upon which these rules were based. At what cost to the standards established by Jesus and exemplified in the Love-Communism of the earliest churches is shown abundantly by the historians.⁶

The earlier, simpler, and more heroic ideals lived on in certain forms of monasticism, but in the main current of development subtle distinctions drawn by the Church Fathers between absolute Christian law and natural law imposed by reason, and relative natural law required by conditions, made it possible for an alien Church to be at home in an age where slavery and corruption and nepotism in its most enervating forms were widespread. And these accommodating elaborations of the Fathers passed on to

⁵ Reflected, for example, in Origen, *Contra Celsum*, V, 37.

⁶ *Epistola ad Diognetum*, 5, 4. See Harnack, *Militia christiana*, pp. 71 ff.

become fundamental doctrines in the imposing system of Christian ethics which emerges toward the end of the Middle Ages, put into final form by the genius of St. Thomas Aquinas.

III

This system is far more than an elaboration of the teachings of earlier Church Fathers, Origen, Lactantius, Augustine, and others. It is an ethic determined by those volcanic forces which left the principal cities of the Empire in the West in ruins, closed the seaways, and turned men away from town life and town polity to which they had been accustomed, and which represented the general ideal of civilization, back to the land, where by tillage and barter for upwards of a thousand years under forms of feudalism the western world eked out its existence. Without reference to this rural and essentially *consumption* economy the social ethics of the medieval Church cannot be understood. There were few strong incentives in the direction of production as production, nor did society as a whole have particular reasons to value or to seek gain as such.

As has been pointed out often,⁷ this system takes for granted *class divisions*. Lord and serf are in their respective positions by the operation of natural law and by divine appointment alike.

In this world of fixed stations, where ambition is not ordinarily permitted to remove men from one rank to another, relations are necessarily *personal relations*. Both equally are subject to the authority of the Church and of divine law. One is under bonds to deal with those whom providence and law have placed under him justly and humanely; the other is bound to show due respect for his superiors and to render such service as is required of his station. Under these assumptions each is entitled to the rewards that correspond to their respective stations. For the superior class to use its position for gross exactions and oppressive demands on those who are weak is to commit sin; on the other hand, for the lower classes to demand more than is called for by their stations is of the nature of rebellion. The relation established is patriarchal

⁷ For example, by Theod. Meyer, *Die christlich-ethischen Social-prinzipien*, etc., especially pp. 70-142.

in its nature, and static. Mutual obligations imposed grow out of the distinctly personal and permanent relations in which the classes stand to one another as benefactors or servants, all under the guidance and rule of the Church.

On these basic presuppositions we have worked out an imposing system of Christian casuistry, noble in its conceptions of human obligations, wherein an equally heavy hand is laid upon those who would indulge in any forms of exploitation and those who sought to escape obligations of work or service. In one case divine law and a kind of *noblesse oblige* called for kindness, charity, and a fair price in all dealings with men. In theory, at least, the medieval social ethic as elaborated by St. Thomas set no special premium upon the acquisition or possession of wealth, save as this was in the end devoted to the ends of charity. The passion for gain is opposed to righteousness and a standing peril of the soul. The ideal state remains that of voluntary poverty exemplified in the monastic life. Barter and trade represent the state of nature not the higher state of grace.

It does not follow that these principles and rubrics of medieval Christian ethics were adhered to strictly in practice. Neither the theory on which they were founded nor the authority of the Church succeeded in keeping landowners, merchants, bankers, and money-changers from the practice of extortion or other temptations and sins arising in the market place. Indeed, their resistance increased, as such great movements as the Crusades opened the doors of the world, and economic changes all over Europe, resulting in revival of town life, offered fresh opportunities for trade and gain. For example, as shown by Sombart and others, religious zeal was hot in Florence, and Tuscany was a veritable citadel of clericism, when these parts of Italy became a Bethlehem of the capitalistic spirit. On the other hand, such facts as are brought to view by peasants' revolts in Germany and elsewhere show how terribly men could be made to suffer, and yet be urged or compelled to accept exactions patiently under a misuse of the conception that respect for and obedience to those who were above them was a fixed and holy obligation, that there was no such thing in the world as a just rebellion of masses of men.

Furthermore, there is a good deal of evidence to show that exigencies in the life of the Church itself and an increasing demand for funds led to relaxation of the very laws against usury and other sins of greed which the Church itself had sanctioned.⁸ One notices also in some of the later Schoolmen, such for example as Antonino of Florence and Bernard of Siena, certain elaborations of ethical theory in the interests of such virtues as industry, economy, and acquisition calculated to lend direct stimulus and sanction to the capitalistic spirit everywhere developing as the Middle Ages drew toward an end.⁹

The completeness of this medieval system is amazing, and any unbiased study of it leads to the conclusion that it was admirably adapted to meet the economic and social economy for the regulation of which it was developed. Why then did it break down under the new conditions which appeared in Europe in the sixteenth century, and why does it remain a serious question whether the ethics of St. Thomas as revived in recent papal encyclicals can have much effect in the modern world?¹⁰ The elaborateness of the system does not conceal its deep-seated and fundamental dualism, which makes it in the end an ethic of compromise. For restless souls it leaves open a door into monasticism where perfection can be sought according to one's heart's desire. For the rest of mankind life in a sinful world is a consequence of man's fall, and of fallen man too much must not be expected, notwithstanding counsels of perfection. While the world is moving into a state of grace by means of the sacraments a certain amount of tolerance for the natural man had to be allowed. In other words, the inherent supernaturalism of the medieval church system which bade men seek their salvation in a higher world tended

⁸ Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p. 81, calls attention to the fact that when Eck, the champion who later crossed swords with Luther, crossed the Alps to seek confirmation at the University of Bologna for his argument that interest could be legally charged in transactions between merchants, the expedition was financed by the great house of Fugger in Augsburg.

⁹ Sombart, *Quintessence of Capitalism*, especially Chap. xviii, pp. 236 ff.

¹⁰ See Troeltsch on the significance of Thomism for Catholic social philosophy in *Social Teachings*, Vol. I, pp. 278 ff.

to leave them freer to do what they pleased in the state imposed upon them by the Fall.

IV

In Protestantism the ethical development was much slower than corresponding movements resulting in change of dogma. Long after declarations of freedom from ecclesiastical dogma and from papal authority had become common we find Protestant writers falling back upon the teachings of St. Thomas for enforcement of the economic and social demands which they wished to see imposed upon society.¹¹ What really compelled departures were the profound changes taking place in the sixteenth century, commonly known as the capitalistic revolution, more far-reaching even than the industrial revolution of the nineteenth, about which a great deal more has been written. The new era began with the substitution of money payments for goods. It supplied a tangible motive for increased production and at once widened the area of financial and industrial operations. As evidenced, for example, by developments in the Low Countries, exchange stimulated international trade, in the wake of which followed a spirit of toleration that the world had not known under medieval conditions. Money payments tended also to increase the independence of workers, and to break up the bondage involved in the prevailing household economy of the earlier period. Establishment of exchanges in larger centers and the coming of free laborers to the towns opened the way for a return to the city type of civilization which had characterized antiquity.

The story of this great transition in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is most fascinating. Beginning in Italy as early as the twelfth century, partly as a result of new movements of peoples and trade stimulated by the Crusades, we find the new money economy making its way across the Alps to appear in the operations of such notable German enterprise as is represented by the house of Fugger. It found permanent lodging in regions adjacent to the sea, as evidenced by such far-flung trade organizations as the Hansa League. In due course Antwerp and other

¹¹ For this ethical lag in English Puritan reformers such as Richard Baxter see Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 221-7.

cities in the Low Countries became the commercial centers of a new world, with banking and business organized very much as in modern times. Effects were felt across the Channel in Tudor England, where tradition and custom fought a losing battle against the "inclosure" of land, and other innovations by which peasant tillage of the land was replaced by profit-making enterprises and devices of various kinds.

Then, when these forces had been at work for a century or more, came the great discoveries, Africa, India, and America, which offered unlimited new materials, fresh supplies of gold and silver, and an outlet for tremendous energies only now released from the superstitions and other thraldoms which had hampered the development of science in the Middle Ages.

When this capitalistic revolution was coming into full swing we find the Reformation emerging. Much paper and ink have been wasted in trying to show, either that the new economic developments caused the religious movement,¹² or that rising Protestantism gave rise to capitalism.¹³ The fact is that these were concurrent movements. Each had its own roots or sources. That they came together at the beginning of the sixteenth century is one of those rare "accidents" of history fraught with such far-reaching consequences to mankind. The fruitage is not unlike what happens when two plants are subject to cross-fertilization. Or, to change the figure of speech, the two movements are like two streams that converge and finally commingle. They become henceforth more or less indistinguishable, with unnumbered reactions and inter-reactions among themselves. As a result, we have in the sixteenth and seventeenth and later centuries development of new conceptions concerning the fundamental relations of religious and secular interests to one another, fundamentally different from the conceptions of which the social ethics of the medieval church are elaborations.

¹² A favorite thesis with the Marxians.

¹³ Supported by Max Weber in his brilliant paper, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, sharply criticized by L. Brentano, *Die Anfänge des modernen Kapitalismus 1912, Exkursen. III, Puritanismus, etc.* Finely evaluated by Georgia Harkness, *John Calvin*, 1932, pp. 187 ff.

The new, bourgeois type of civilization which emerged with the beginning of modern times tested the vitality of religion. As we have already seen, in Italy and elsewhere it became apparent that the older ethic of the Church could not deal with it. Already we begin to have adaptations in Catholic theory designed to satisfy the reason and conscience of men who were business bent in a new world.¹⁴

And by their relation to this new type of civilization the movements comprehended under the general term, Protestant, have to be appraised and judged.

Here, on the one hand, was a new world of interests and endeavors, subject to fresh conquest by religion. On the other hand, there was the possibility that religion itself might be submerged by the new tides. As a matter of fact, both appear to happen. There are rare moments when it looks as if the impulses and ideals of original Christian teaching were on the way to dominate many or all of these new forces. There are more times when these impulses and ideals seem to be under more or less complete control by the spirit of capitalism.

By a coincidence which may be regarded either as reactionary or prophetic, according to the viewpoint from which it is approached and considered, it was the effort of the house of Fugger to reimburse themselves for money loaned to Albert of Brandenburg in purchasing the archbishopric of Mainz, by sale of indulgences, that loosed the fiery spirit of Luther.¹⁵ At the same time, the movement which Luther launched, as it took final form in the German churches, was largely barren so far as social ethics are concerned, while it was far-reaching and dynamic theologically in the assertion of the independence and spiritual freedom of man's soul. In a striking passage Tawney¹⁶ outlines the various attitudes which reformed opinion might assume to the outbursts of economic enterprise at the beginning of the Reformation. It might follow the lead of the Renaissance, welcoming the new forces as instruments of wealth and luxury. A possibility which

¹⁴ A discriminating summary is given by Harkness, *John Calvin*, Chap. x, pp. 192 ff., "Assets and Liabilities."

¹⁵ Ashley, *Economic History*, 1893, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 442-3.

¹⁶ *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 80 ff.

in the nature of the case was always remote. Or it might defy these forces, of which there was momentary indication in popular uprisings and demands for the suppression of the extortioner following in the wake of the new gospel of spiritual freedom as proclaimed by Luther. But this was only momentary. It ended finally by compromising.

The surprising and tragic thing that we have to note in Luther and in nearly all succeeding reformers is social conservatism, joined with tremendous emphasis upon religious individualism.

When we laud Luther's defiance of ecclesiastical tyranny and trace out the consequences of his assertions of the right of the soul to approach God directly without intervention of altar or priest, we must understand how the same fundamental individualism could resent discipline and control in the sphere of social relations, especially when attempt is made to impose these controls from without. And just this happened notwithstanding Luther's sincere, if somewhat naïve, fulminations against usurers and extortioners of every kind.

At crucial points Luther fell back upon the ethical doctrines of the Church whose authority he questioned so vehemently. He took for granted the class divisions and the ideas of "calling" or vocation which made it necessary for the average man to accept the station in life which he held as more or less fixed and divinely appointed.

Moreover, the exigencies of Luther's own situation compelled alliance with the state system which prevailed in northern Europe, which practically compelled subordination of the Church to state policy in economic and social matters—all of which was made easier by the tendency of the Lutherans to fall back upon a mystical retreat into inner life for peace and happiness. So that we find growing up a mischievous distinction between religious matters and secular matters, the latter including all that pertained to private business and public financial and economic policy. So that there were no conscious inconsistencies, and no pangs of conscience in proclaiming on the one hand the priesthood and kingship of all believers and urging on the other hand the suppression by blood and iron of those classes of society which suffered most from the capitalistic revolution, and whose hopes were awakened by procla-

mation of a gospel of freedom. It is not necessary to deny any of Luther's mighty contributions to the emancipation of mankind in coming to the conclusion that Lutheranism lost itself in quicksands and shoals so far as social ethics are concerned.¹⁷

V

In the beginning at least the course taken by Calvin seemed to offer different results. Deriving many of his leading ideas from earlier reformers, such as Hus, Zwingli and Luther, Calvin elaborated a system in which this breach between Christian profession and social-economic practice was greatly narrowed or closed altogether. Unlike the monk of Wittenberg, who in the last analysis harked back in his social teachings to the social system out of which medieval ethics grew, the Genevan reformer accepted as existing and inevitable the new bourgeois world, in which Luther was never at home. At the same time, Calvin's genius was marked by a logical consistency which made it impossible for him to relent or compromise in this bourgeois world. Consequently, the ethical system evolved by his thinking and under his leadership, while marked by great rigors, was such as could live and thrive in an age that was moving rapidly from a consumers' to a producers' economy.

It is a fact of great significance that in an age strongly bent on discovery and adventures of all kinds Calvin shifts the focal point of living from emotions and intellect to the will. The trend of his teaching is in dynamic rather than in mystical directions. Under his guidance the spirit of man departs from cloisters to do its ascetic battles in an arena representing the whole of life. It is not accidental that he should choose the little bourgeois city of Geneva as a center for his experiment in establishing a "commonwealth of God," where the lines of demarcation between the religious life and secular life were practically effaced, and where everything is brought under the sway of spirit emancipated and subject only to the will of God. Where could such teachings be promulgated with more effect than among shopkeepers, small traders, and other representatives of an aspiring and self-conscious middle

¹⁷ Compare the unbiased conclusions of Troeltsch, *Social Teachings*, Vol. II, pp. 515 f.

class to whom the virtues of application and economy and self-denial which were urged reacted at once to the advantage of the business in which they were engaged?

But it must not be forgotten that while Calvin accepted the bourgeois world and with refreshing frankness removed the ban from the taking of interest,¹⁸ all these concessions were joined with an iron discipline, which for the moment, in Geneva at least, was strong enough to keep the spirit of capitalism in bounds. The jagged dualism, on which Lutheran ethics so nearly went to pieces, did not exist for Calvinism in its earliest forms. Calvin nowhere admits any separation of any affairs from the life of the spirit. All worlds exist for the glory of God. Election by God's grace carries with it the most meticulous regulation of conduct in every conceivable relation, both by one's own conscience and by the Word of God as understood by those who had the authority to interpret and to execute the same.

VI

This being so, there remains for investigation the important question, by what paths early Calvinism was able to descend to the levels of mercantile and industrial ethics sanctioned and practised in regions where Calvinism had been dominating or very influential.

Resistance to the rigorous controls which Calvin imposed upon individual conduct in the interests of the common good appears early. In Geneva itself under Calvin's immediate successors there are unmistakable signs among the bourgeois laity of opposition to too rigorous control of profit taking.¹⁹ The same opposition appears in France and notably in the Low Countries, where there was strong disposition to exclude the Church altogether from a voice in matters affecting exchange and the conduct of business.

But more is involved than mere rejections of too rigorous restriction upon trade. Although we do not accept Weber's contention that Calvinism is responsible mainly for the growth of

¹⁸ Letter to Sachinus, 1545. As pointed out by Harkness, *John Calvin*, pp. 207 ff., Calvin imposes so many conditions, that the modern money-lender would regard what he says as forbidding rather than permitting the taking of interest.

¹⁹ For instances see Choisy, *L'État chrétien calviniste*, pp. 119-21.

capitalism in the Low Countries, in England and in North America, where Calvinism was most powerful, we are by no means disposed to deny that there were *positive elements* in the Calvinistic ethics which made it the natural ally of commercialism, springing from other roots and destined to notable expansion in these particular regions. Many independent forces were at work in the capitalistic revolution which was taking place while the Reformation was spreading over the world. That emphasis upon the so-called "economic virtues," self-denial, economy, industry, and so on, at such times and under such conditions, acted as a powerful stimulant to this development it is difficult to deny.

Particular conditions in Geneva, joined with the powerful personality of Calvin himself, made possible temporarily the almost complete domination of daily life by rigorous and ascetic religious ideals. In France and the Low Countries, as we have seen, there were early signs of bourgeois rebellion. This was even more pronounced in England and among the English colonies in America, where there was no such intimate and sympathetic connection between the Church and the State for the enforcement of ethical demands as existed in the Genevan experiment. In England, where the interests of the State and those of the Church were often opposed, ethical practice found itself drawn in different directions by conflicting currents. Here were great new opportunities for gain, sustained by leases and charters received at the hands of the civil power, the lure of which was too great to be put aside because of Scripture, as interpreted by Calvin or even as sustained by conscience.

There was a dilemma that had to be solved if men were to continue comfortable in their new pursuits. This was done by a return to the dualism, so vigorously rejected by Calvin and his understanding followers.

In giving validity to new opportunities offered and sanctioned by the State recourse was had to the ancient idea of natural law, strongly sustained by rationalism and the humanists, by which activities of trade could be justified independently of ethics. Once this path is taken, it descends easily to the secularism, which in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries left business free to be car-

ried on *laissez faire* without any regard whatever to the sanctions of religion.

Although the full tide of the capitalistic revolution did not break in England until after it had run quite a course on the Continent, when it came it did shake English social organization to the foundations. In the beginning the questions involved affected chiefly land, whether customs and traditions which had insured certain common rights to those who occupied and tilled the soil should be set aside in the interests of larger production and gain by large land owners and *entrepreneurs*. Reactions against exploiters by religionists were pronounced. Bucer, the tutor of Edward VI, in his *De regno Christi* set forth an ideal of the commonwealth of God for England worthy of his master Calvin in Geneva, and other divines such as Thomas Lever²⁰ strongly upheld the sterner ideals. Why then did the new tides succeed in breaking through such dykes, finally sweeping over and submerging the green fields of England?

In a passage of rare insight²¹ Tawney points out that in all these land questions the real enemies were not Northumberlands or Herberts. Rather what these early English representatives of Calvinism had to attack was a forming idea, namely, "that the individual is absolute master of his own, and within the limits set by positive law, may exploit it with a single eye to his pecuniary advantage, unrestrained by any obligation to postpone his own profit to the well-being of his neighbors, or to give account of his actions to a higher authority. . . . In short, the theory of property which was later to be accepted by all civilized communities." Finally, Puritanism, the natural descendant of Calvinistic asceticism, fell in with this philosophy, the period of the Civil War being a kind of a divide between these two apparently contrary eras in the history of Puritanism.

In the religious sphere we find a whole series of what have been called concurring accidents which tended to weaken the "controls" which in the earliest periods of the English Reformation acted to hold economic individualism in leash. Under the late Tudors and the early Stuarts there had grown up an ecclesiastical

²⁰ *Sermons*, 1550, edited by E. Arber.

²¹ *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 146 f.

polity which, reversing the traditional relations between Church and State, sought to make the former an instrument of the royal will, and to a large extent succeeded in doing so.

With vehemence the rising tide of Puritan dissent rejected the overlordship of an unjust and vacillating government, and with equal vehemence ecclesiastical control of every sort. But if men are not rightfully subject either to unjust governments or the rule of priests, why should regulations affecting the most vital matters of daily life be imposed from without? The same spirit of individualism which supported nonconformity in worship called for freedom in business. As on the Continent so in England and in the English colonies this religious radicalism made its strongest appeal not to the nobility, who were the chief beneficiaries of control by the State, nor to their immediate dependents who retained so much of the habit of servility bred by feudalism, but to classes carrying on small business, many of them living in towns, whose livelihood depended upon their own energy and adaptability. In other words, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the rising middle classes in England were the natural seed bed for both religious and economic independency.

Still another contributing factor, often overlooked, is the fact that by reason of dissent these classes were cut off from certain spheres of interest and activity, such as the universities, the church, the bar, and public office, just as the Jews were segregated in the Middle Ages. In both cases those thus debarred gave themselves all the more intensely to activity in the spheres which were open, namely, commercial and business activities.

Time came when English religious radicalism, greatly slowed down, and reaping the large fruits that came from the practice of the "economic virtues," was ready to join hands with a philosophy which offered justification for the course of its development. This philosophy stood ready at hand in the form of new ideas about "Political Arithmetic" (afterwards political economy), shaped largely under the influence of scientific and materialistic rationalism on the Continent and given more or less classical form by John Locke, whereby the law of contracts was substituted for the old law of nature and the rights of property given a validity which they never possessed in medieval philosophy or ethics, the

very thought of which would have caused Calvin to turn in his grave. Thus at last, for even Puritans, trade rested upon its own foundations. Property is more than lives. Religion and commerce are divorced.

After the final establishment of this dualism, and the practical exclusion of the Church from secular affairs, it was not a very long step to the point where a kind of halo could be thrown about the life of trade and where the honors that had once gone to charity and self-sacrifice found themselves turned into what was little short of worship of material success, and we come to what seems to be the bottom of the abyss in the eighteenth century maxims of New England's Benjamin Franklin, where gain is the justification of virtue and all things exist for the sake of accumulation.²²

Asked to pass judgment upon the ethics of Puritanism, we should not minimize its real contributions to political freedom or to religious liberalism. But we would be compelled to say that its real measure is the social type which it encouraged and produced and that this type of character is essentially bourgeois.

Having followed roughly the way in which Calvinism and capitalism interacted in English life, it need not surprise us to find prominent independents among the advisers of Charles II after the restoration, and devout Presbyterians prominent in the management of the East India Company. Nor are we surprised later when eminent nonconformist divines such as Thomas Chalmers²³ oppose poor laws on the ground that poverty is the fault of the individual, for which society has no responsibility. In the same spirit it is argued that low wages are a blessing, because they encourage men to industry and thrift.²⁴ All which gives terrible poignancy to the complaint of Marx in his *Communist Manifesto*²⁵ that "when the bourgeoisie gain the upper hand idyllic relations are pitilessly torn aside, leaving only naked self-interest and callous cash payment."

With these seventeenth and eighteenth century backgrounds it is easy to see why, with the advent of invention and new machinery

²² Cited by Weber, *The Protestant Ethic*, pp. 48 ff.

²³ T. Mackey, *History of the English Poor Law*, Vol. III, pp. 32-4.

²⁴ Petty, *Political Arithmetic*, p. 45.

²⁵ Marx, *Das kommunistische Manifest*, pp. 27-8.

in the nineteenth century and its application to production on a vaster scale than had been conceivable heretofore, the Church was so largely acquiescent in the great industrial revolution. Long before the revolution came, general acceptance of Utilitarianism had drawn most of its ethical fangs. The best that the nineteenth century Church seemed able to do was to offer charity to those whose callings involved them in suffering and perpetual humiliation. Seldom did it attack causes producing such suffering and humiliation. Similarly in the wider world, it managed to produce missionary movements designed to mitigate at some points the ravages inflicted upon various peoples by the commercial fury which demanded materials which these regions offered and wider consumption of the products of western factories. Only in very recent times has the irony of Christian impotence in face of the real facts been brought home to the consciousness of the Church.

VII

Up to the present time two imposing systems of Christian social ethics have evolved, namely, the medieval system and the system emanating from Geneva. One failed because the world outgrew it, the other broke down because the acquisitive passions of men proved stronger than its established disciplines. What of the future?

Writing twenty-five years ago, Ernest Troeltsch, after the fullest survey of the facts that has been written, came to the conclusion that at the turn of the century all Christian social work was in a problematic condition, with contemporary forms of the Christian doctrine of society and of social development impotent in face of the tasks with which men are confronted.²⁶

The lapse of a quarter century and more offers little encouragement for any immediate change in this opinion. If anything, happenings in most recent years have emphasized the helplessness of the whole Christian body, not only in the face of war, but of the upheavals arising from failure of nineteenth century economic and social institutions longer to function.

But those who look at matters with some perspective will not doubt that a fresh system of Christian ethics will emerge.

²⁶ *Social Teachings*, Vol. II, pp. 391 ff.

This system will not be any return to primitive Christian ethics, but present-day adaptations of certain permanent impulses of a deeply religious character. No more will it be a revival of medievalism or of the ethics of Geneva. For this new ethic we must look to interactions between fundamental religious impulses and a social economy different from any that have appeared heretofore.

Just as medieval ethics has agriculture for its essential background, and just as Protestant social ethics centers around the coming of money and the rise of the middle classes, so large-scale machinery development may well furnish the occasion and stimulus for the next Christian ethical movement.

The thing that will have to be dealt with is not the machine as such, but those imposing financial and industrial organizations which have grown up concurrently with the extension of machinery for the management of wealth. These vast organizations are impersonal. Individual conscience no matter how well intentioned cannot cope with them. Some form of social control seems inevitable, commensurate with the magnitude and character of the forces that have to be dealt with. How will the Christian ethical tradition adapt itself so as to sanction this new control?

So far as we can discern, the initiating impulse which inspired and created the medieval ethic came from the so-called upper levels of life. In considering it we never get away from a certain authoritative and aristocratic tradition. Bourgeois interests were dominant in the shaping of the Protestant ethic. It remains to be seen whether the impetus to a fresh development may not come from what the modern world calls the proletariat, largely suppressed under the medieval régime and often neglected in the middle class development.

In the last analysis the fate of any ethical system depends upon its sanctions. The sanctions by which both the older systems sought to maintain themselves leave the present age cold. Supernaturalism does not suffice. No more does the ideal of a theocracy. Dictatorships, especially as they threaten to become permanent, are intolerable. It remains to be seen whether with the approval and aid of Christianity adequate sanctions can be developed out of the instincts and intelligence of society itself. The future of Christian social ethics is involved with the fate of democracy.

RAYMOND ALBERT WASER

*Minister of the Enfield Congregational Church,
Enfield, Connecticut*

A BRIEF STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN THE EIGHTH CHAPTER OF
PROVERBS AND THE PROLOGUE
OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

A BRIEF STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EIGHTH CHAPTER OF PROVERBS AND THE PROLOGUE OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

By RAYMOND ALBERT WASER

THE interest of the writer in this study is due to a short series of lectures on the Book of Proverbs presented by Duncan Black Macdonald. Commenting on the eighth chapter of the book, he pointed out its almost echo-like reproduction in the Prologue of St. John. In *The Moslem World* his position is clearly stated: "There is a kinship more than merely verbal or of coincidence between Proverbs viii and the Prologue of John. . . . In the purpose of God, it fell to the Hebrews, through their holding fast to, and yet purifying and moralising the divine Paternity, and through their personifying of a special divine Wisdom, begotten and with God before all things, a Wisdom that is also the guide of all men to lead directly up to the revelation in Christ of the person of God."¹

I

The question of the origin of the *Logos* doctrine in the Prologue of John has been a matter of contention among scholars. In the large, they are divided into two camps—the Hebraic and the Greek. On the extreme of one camp is Rendell Harris. The term *Logos* in John is a definite substitute chosen by John for the Hebrew term *sophia*.² On the extreme of the other stands P. W. Schmiedel: "It should therefore never have been doubted that John borrowed the word λόγος and the ideas associated with it from Philo."³

Hence it is essential to consider the concept of the *Logos* in Philo. Philo borrowed his term from the Stoics. His use of the

¹ D. B. Macdonald, *The Moslem World*, Vol. VI, pp. 26-7.

² R. Harris, *The Origin of the Prologue in St. John's Gospel*, p. 6.

³ P. W. Schmiedel, *The Johanne Writings*, p. 152.

term was quite different from theirs because he had a very different concept of deity. It is just at this point that there occurs the sharpest distinction between the thinking of Philo and that of John. To Philo, God was pure Being. He was an abstract, static Unity—pure, immaterial Intellect. Due to the very constitution of the world, God was transcendent and could have no relation with us. As a result, God was described by negatives—unknowable, inscrutable. Such a one can best be described as “It is.”⁴ Commenting upon this concept of God, G. F. Moore states: “Wholly remote from Jewish thought is the idea of the nature of God as an unknowable and unnamable Absolute as Philo conceives it when he developed his fundamental philosophy.”⁵ Further, wholly remote in Jewish thought is the concept of an inactive God. The God of the Bible is in its own expressive phrase a “live God,” a God who is doing things. He sends floods and plagues. He makes special covenants with the people of Israel. He hears the prayers of the psalmists and sends out the prophets.

This was the God of John. He was a real personality, an active, living God. It is in John that we find the great phrase on the activity of God, “My Father worketh even until now, and I work” (John v: 17). So essential is activity to God’s own peculiar nature and His relation to the world that He does not cease to work and create even on holy days and Sabbaths. Further, to John God was person. He was one who could be known and called “Father.” Such a one can best be described as “Thou art.” The fundamental difference between the God of John and that of Philo is the fundamental difference between “Thou” and “It.”

Against this background of deity the *Logos* doctrines of Philo and John must be examined. Philo bridges the wide gulf between a God who is pure Being and a world of Becoming by the *Logos*. The *Logos* is the chief active intermediary between the world of men and an inactive deity. By means of it, God and the divine come into contact with the universe. It is at this point that the *Logos* of Philo becomes a contradiction. His *Logos* is both an independent hypostasis and an immanent manifestation of the divine

⁴ G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 417.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 361.

will and existence. He maintains both of these definitions apparently without observing their contradiction.⁶

John's use and concept of the *Logos* was quite different from that of Philo because his concept of God was different. His God was a living, active God. Hence his *Logos* was not "the earthly representative" of an inactive deity. The *Logos* was of the same class as deity. It became incarnate in man. At the same time it was distinct from God; yet so like Him that it could say: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John xiv: 9), and in will was so identical it could say: "I and the Father are one" (John x: 30). Thus John used the term not to keep a transcendent God inactive as was Philo's purpose, but to show how an active God had come *into* human history in the person of Jesus Christ. This *Logos* which had created the world and existed in the beginning now has taken flesh and has come into real and living contact with human beings.

Further, to Philo God is transcendent by the very constitution of the world. In John, God is transcendent, but His transcendence is on the whole ethical and not metaphysical. The world is separated from God not by its constitution but by its sinfulness. Jesus comes to clear away the wide and present gulf of darkness and sin. Hence the concepts of Light and Life dominate the Prologue. These ideas are grounded in the Old Testament. Philo was not concerned with them as a definite part or even function of the *Logos*.⁷ Preexistent, creating and sustaining all life, being in the closest of relationships with God, being of God, giving life and light to men, reflecting the very character of God Himself—such is John's *Logos*. Such a doctrine finds its real roots in the God and concepts of the Old Testament.

In the face of this, the major census of modern scholarship rejects the proposition that John's doctrine of the *Logos* was bor-

⁶ "Nay, he is unable to observe it," states Zeller, "because otherwise the intermediary rôle assigned to the *Logos* would be forfeited, even its double nature, by reason of which it is on the one hand to be identical with God, that a participation in the Deity may by its means be possible to the finite, and on the other hand different from Him, that the Deity, notwithstanding this participation, may remain apart from all contact with the world." E. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, Vol. III, 2, p. 365.

⁷ W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 194.

rowed or directly influenced by the *Logos* doctrine of Philo, and maintains the source in some current of Hebrew thought.⁸ The particular current—whether it be that of the Memra, Shekinah, Word or Wisdom—is the main matter of contention. The position of the writer is that of H. R. Mackintosh. First, the evangelist uses Philo's term to deny Philo's thought. In John the *Logos* is not the rational cosmic order, the immanent reason, a static ideal, nor a being to separate God from the world. It is personal and divine. It mediates in the creation of the world and "enters human life by becoming flesh in order to reveal the heart of God." Hence John changes Philo's notions so radically that he transforms them into direct opposites.⁹ Secondly, John chose the term not only to contradict its current meanings, but because it did express his idea of Christ. It expressed for him more significantly than any other word that aspect of the life and work of Christ which he held as fundamental. Further, he saw the universal and cosmopolitan nature of the term. The idea of the *Logos* was familiar to both Greek and Jew. Its heritage to the Greeks came down the years from Heraclitus. To the Hebrews it came from the concept of the Wisdom and Word of God in the Old Testament. Yet though both had a *Logos* heritage, it was from the latter that John derived his fundamental doctrine.¹⁰

Therefore, we must place our plow in Hebraic soil in our search to uncover the probable roots of the *Logos* concept of John. In this paper, the particular ground to be considered is that of the personified Wisdom of the Hebrews.

II

That the Wisdom of Proverbs is a personification is little questioned. The words of the Jewish scholar, J. Abelson, are

⁸ In the above census, references are made to the following scholars: G. F. Moore, Vol. I, p. 417; J. H. Bernard, *Commentary on St. John*, p. cxxxix; F. Godet, *Commentary on St. John*, p. 180; C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 39; G. H. C. Macgregor, *The Gospel of John*, p. xxxvii; B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 374-7; E. F. Scott, *The Gospel and Its Tributaries*, p. 187; B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 5; H. H. Wendt, *Commentary on St. John*, p. 180.

⁹ H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 116.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 117.

significant: "If there is anything in the Old Testament which may be rightly characterized as an instance of personification it is the 'Wisdom' of the eighth chapter of the Book of Proverbs."¹¹ A detailed study of this Wisdom will be presented in the last section of this paper. For our present purpose it is necessary to grasp its fundamental concept and follow its influence in later Hebrew thought. In Proverbs viii Wisdom is a personality who existed before the world with God (22-26). She was the agent through whom the worlds were made (27-31). She has cried out continually to men to be their guide (1-21). Her special mission is to impart life, and that life is imparted by accepting her and allying oneself with her (32-36). So influential was this idea of a preexistent, personified Wisdom that all the great Wisdom literature that followed found in it a starting-point.¹²

The Wisdom of Ecclesiasticus xxiv: 1-22 possesses all the attributes of the Wisdom of Proverbs viii. She was created "from the beginning of the world" (9). Once she was open to the possession of all men (6-7). Now she chooses Israel for her abiding place—"and so was I established in Sion" (10). Thus Wisdom has come unto her own. A comparison with John i: 11 is suggested: "He came unto His own." It is at this point that Wisdom, after telling us who she is and her relationship to Jehovah, speaks the words, the echo of which is found in the gospel narrative:

Come unto me, ye that are desirous of me,
And be ye filled with my produce.
For my memorial is sweeter than honey,
And mine inheritance than the honey-comb.
(xxiv: 19-20)

A similar plea substituting the word yoke for memorial is found in chapter li: 23-27.

The Wisdom of Solomon follows Ecclesiasticus in chronological order. In the significant Wisdom passage vii: 22-viii: 1, a high-water mark is reached in the development of the Wisdom concept. The first striking aspect of the passage is its genuine echo in Hebrews i: 2-3. The second striking aspect is the emphasis placed on certain words. The emphasis in verses 25-26 is not so

¹¹ J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God*, p. 199.

¹² C. H. Toy, *The Book of Proverbs*, p. 592.

own and they that were His own received Him not" (John i: 11). What the Jewish Apocalypse says of Wisdom, the Prologue of John repeats of the *Logos*.

It is evident from these sources that in its essence the Wisdom of the Hebrews was a *Logos* conception. Wisdom was with God in the beginning. Through her all things came into being. The character of God was revealed through her. She possessed the power, the glory, the light, and the life of God. To follow after her and to bear her "yoke" was the way of life. That this concept is that underlying the *Logos* doctrine of John is the contention of the writer. To consider the evidence that the early church identified this Wisdom of God with the person of Jesus Christ, an identification expressed in its fullest manifestation in the Prologue of John, is the next matter for consideration.

III

The Johannine view of the person of Christ as the *Logos* is generally looked upon as the last stage in New Testament thought. It is maintained that in John we have a new doctrine of the person of Jesus. The purpose of this chapter is to consider the evidence that points to the very opposite conclusion. The Johannine Christ represents one of the first stages of Christian belief. It represents the Christ of a firmly established tradition. It was an accepted fact among the early Christians that Christ had created and supported the world through history. On the idea of the pre-existence of Christ, a scholar such as H. R. Mackintosh goes so far as to say: "There is some reason to believe, indeed, that it derives ultimately from Jesus."¹⁵ In the interpretation of this aspect of the person of Jesus, one of the earliest strands of first century Christian tradition identifies Him with the Wisdom of God. The moment this was done, there came into the world of Christian thought the concept of what John was to call the *Logos* Christ. Wernle states: "Nothing, however, is more opposed to the truth than to isolate it, and to ascribe to it a solitary originality to which it makes no claim whatever itself."¹⁶

¹⁵ H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

¹⁶ P. Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. II, p. 254.

The first evidence is the collection of quotations known as the *Testimonies Against the Jews*. The quotations in the book were from Jewish writings. Their object was to prove scripturally to the Jews (and therefore conclusively) the Christian claims and doctrines. The date of the book is uncertain. However, that it was compiled and circulated during the period between the death of Christ and the circulation of the first gospels is unquestioned. In the second book of these *Testimonies* are found the passages on the person of Christ. In the opening lines Christ is set forth as the Wisdom of God:

1. *Christum primogenitum esse et ipsum sapientiam Dei, per quem omnia facta sunt.*
2. *Quod Sapientia Dei Christus. . .*

Thus in the earliest extant text setting forth "Christian doctrine" the testimony identifies Christ with the Wisdom of God. This is the foundation stone of the book of *Testimonies*. The truth of the doctrine was proved by Old Testament passages. The first passage quoted to prove the person of Christ as the Wisdom of God was Proverbs viii: 23-31. This in turn was followed by Ecclesiasticus xxiv: 3-16, 19. That this identification of Christ as Wisdom was made at this early date points to a very early strand of such tradition, perhaps finding its roots in the words of Christ Himself. That such a possibility was probable we shall consider in our study of the Q document.

The second evidence of such an identification is that found in the letters of Paul. The following passages are pertinent: 1 Corinthians i: 24, 30; ii: 7-9; Philippians ii: 5-8; Colossians i: 13-17; ii: 2-3, 9. In these passages two aspects of the person of Christ are definitely set forth. The first is that of the preexistent, creative, and sustaining Christ. All things are created through Him (δι' αὐτοῦ) and unto Him (εἰς αὐτὸν); and "He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together" (καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν). Though He was not recognized He was in the world from the first. "He was the first-born of all the creatures." He was the spiritual rock that followed the Israelites (1 Cor. x: 4). Paul ascribes this same function to

the Christ as the Wisdom of Solomon ascribes to the personified Wisdom of God:

She brought them over the Red Sea
And led them through much water. (x:18)

The second aspect is that of the revealing Christ. Christ is the revelation of the mystery of God which has been hidden yet fore-ordained from the beginning of the world. In Colossians ii: 2-3 Paul preaches "that they may know the mystery of God, even Christ." In 1 Corinthians i: 24 we know that Christ is the Wisdom of God. With these two statements as a key, the long passage in 1 Corinthians i: 18-ii: 16 becomes intelligible. Consider ii: 7-8: "We speak God's wisdom (Christ) in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden . . . , which none of the rulers of this world hath known: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory." Here Paul presents the foreordination of the Divine Wisdom by God unto our glory before the worlds were created. This Wisdom, existing before the worlds and which was so foreordained, he identifies with Christ. It is "Christ Jesus, who was made unto us Wisdom from God" (1 Cor. i: 30) who has revealed to us the way of salvation.

Thus Paul contains the elements of the *Logos* Christ of John. "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." He could have easily—as far as doctrine goes—identified his pre-existent, creating, sustaining, and revealing Christ with the *Logos*. According to Schweitzer, Paul did not do so because his interest was eschatological. It fell to John to bring the *Logos* concept of Christ's person, a concept Paul knew and preached, into vogue.¹⁷ This *Logos* concept of Paul is the Wisdom concept of the Hebrews, a concept which he *received* from the tradition of the early church.

That Paul received this tradition concerning the person of Christ is quite apparent. It is not original with him. "Nowhere is his tone that of a sponsor for a doctrinal novelty."¹⁸ The idea of the preexistence and creative power of Christ was a familiar one among Christians. From our sources it is very evident that

¹⁷ A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul*, p. 43.

¹⁸ H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

Here is expressed the Wisdom of the Hebrews and the very *Logos* of John.

The Son was the one "through whom" God made the worlds and who "upholds all things by the word of his power." Like the *Logos* Christ of John, the Son here is the co-worker of God in creating, sustaining, and governing the world. Like the Wisdom of the Wisdom of Solomon, the Son here is "the effulgence of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness. She [He] maketh all things new; and in all ages entering into holy souls, she [He] maketh them friends of God" (vii: 25-27). Further:

Since then the children are partakers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same . . . for verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham. Wherefore, it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren. (ii:14-17a)

Here we have also *καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. The link between the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Prologue of John is a close one. The Son who existed in the beginning with God, through whom the worlds were created, has become *σὰρξ* is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of John's Prologue. The writer of the former has portrayed his person of Christ from a strand of early Christian tradition which identified the historic Christ with the Wisdom of the Hebrews.

The fourth evidence of such an identification is that found in the Synoptic Gospels. The first passages that fall in this category are those of Matthew xi: 25-30 and Luke x: 21-22:

At that season Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father, for so it was well pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him. Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. (Matt. xi: 25-30)

In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father;

for so it was well pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him. (Luke x: 21-22)

The above passages (with the possible exception of Matthew xi: 28-30) are undeniably from the Q source. The Q source is recognized as one of an early date. Harnack and Streeter place it at an earlier date than the Gospel of Mark itself. In the light of this, the above passages have appeared "awkward" to most scholars. They seem out of place; they are not in the evolutionary scheme of early theology as some would reconstruct it. Yet the manuscript evidence is almost unanimous in both gospels. How then can we explain this "Johannine thunderbolt" in the Q source? The Apologists in their defense of the Christology of the Synoptics and John always quoted Matthew xi: 27. This *logion* was considered characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. On this point Lightfoot states "and hitherto they have not been answered." That contention is still true.

The terms Father and Son are not simply religious terms in this passage. They are terms which contain a metaphysical expression. If they are the words of Jesus (and as they are in Q, they are very early) then the historic Jesus attributed to himself "a unique—a metaphysically unique—relation to God."²² If they are not the words of Jesus, they were a metaphysical theological expression which early dogmatic speculation took possession of in its interpretation of the Christ. In the summary of C. G. Montefiore, the Christ of this passage is the only Son of God, unto whom all things are delivered, who alone knows the Father, and who alone is "the only door to such knowledge."²³ Immediately the great Johannine passage comes to mind, "No one cometh to the Father except through Me." Further, Montefiore who links up vv. 28-30 of Matthew with the preceding ones concludes: "He who makes these assertions of his position, knowledge, and power also declares that he is meek and lowly in heart, and that his yoke is easy and burden light."²⁴

²² C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. II, p. 169.

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ *ibid.*

Thus the question comes—what is the source for such a concept of the person of Christ? Nearly all scholarship agrees that the source is the Wisdom of the Hebrews. It is the Wisdom of God who speaks the words of these passages. This Wisdom of God is identified with Jesus Christ. The disagreements of modern scholars on this passage are concerned primarily with the question as to whether or no these are the words of Jesus himself or the words of a Wisdom hymn ascribed to Him by the early church. Oscar Holtzmann and George A. Barton maintain that these are the genuine words of Jesus through which He blazed the way for the identification of Himself as the Wisdom of God.²⁵ B. W. Bacon, A. Loisy, C. G. Montefiore, and W. C. Allen uphold the position that these are not the words of Jesus but are the words of an early Christian hymn in which Jesus is exalted by identifying Him with the eternal Wisdom who alone knows God fully.²⁶ However, the crux of the discussion for this paper is not so much whether these are or are not the words of Jesus Himself, but that in one of the earliest strands of Christian tradition *Jesus Christ was identified as the Wisdom of God*. Therefore in the mind of Q at least, one of the aspects of the person of Christ was that Jesus is the Wisdom of God. Conceding that the passage of Matthew xi: 25-30 and Luke x: 21-22 represent a mode of thought and speech antecedent to the Johannine—"then it is not the Fourth Gospel which should be used to interpret the *logion*, but the *logion* and its connections (Wisdom literature) which should be used to interpret the Fourth Gospel. For the theme of the Johannine writer is no other than this same saving *gnosis* which comes to the world through the Son's revelation of the Father."²⁷

Further, the affinity of this Wisdom passage in Matthew with that of Ecclesiasticus li. is a close one both in general scope and in several details. Both constitute a prayer to God. Both contain the same three elements: thanksgiving, revelation, invitation. Each

²⁵ G. A. Barton, *Studies in New Testament Christianity*, p. 27; O. Holtzmann, *The Life of Jesus*, p. 284.

²⁶ See especially B. W. Bacon, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. IX, pp. 382-415.

²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 384.

opens his prayer by praise and thanks to God (Ecclesiasticus li: 1, Matthew xi: 25). Each then proceeds to speak of the revelation he has received (Ecclesiasticus li: 17, Matthew xi: 27). The invitation of Jesus, son of Sirach, extends to all the unlearned to ally themselves with this Wisdom he has known:

Draw near unto me, ye unlearned. . . .
Put your neck under the yoke (of Wisdom),
And let your soul bear her burden. . . .
Behold with your eyes,
How that I labored but a little
And found for myself much rest. (li: 23, 26, 2)

In comparison Matthew xi: 28-30 is quoted:

Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will
give you rest.
Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me;
For I am meek and lowly of heart; and ye shall find rest unto
your souls.
For my yoke is easy, and my burden light.

Thus the Son of Sirach invites the unlearned to put their necks under the yoke of Wisdom and receive instruction because he found rest there. Jesus, on the other hand, either puts Himself or is put *deliberately* in place of the Divine Wisdom and invites all that labor to take His yoke upon them and learn of Him who is meek and lowly of heart.

The second Synoptic passages in which the Wisdom strand of tradition is apparent are Matthew xxiii: 34-37 and Luke xi: 49-51, xiii: 34. The Lucan passage is quoted:

Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles; and some of them they shall kill and persecute; that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required in this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary: yea I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation. (Luke xi: 49-51)

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her; how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not! (Luke xiii: 34)

There are especially two things of note in the parallels. First—Luke attributes the saying xi: 49-51 to the Wisdom of God (*διὰ*

τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν). This provides the link to the parallel in Matthew xxiii: 34-36. In our present Matthew it is Jesus who speaks. The question immediately arises: does Luke identify Jesus with the Wisdom of God or is he quoting from a lost Apocryphal book? C. G. Montefiore maintains the latter position.²⁸ On the other hand, Loisy affirms that "the Wisdom of God is intended by the evangelist to be Christ." In the mind of Luke it is Christ as the Wisdom of God who has sent the prophets and wise men and has sought to save Jerusalem. Otherwise there would be little point in quoting the saying. To Luke these were the *logia* of Christ even as they were to Matthew. However, being more faithful to the source Q than Matthew, he has preserved for us the identification of Jesus as the Wisdom of God—that which throughout the ages has been trying to reveal itself to the souls of men.

The second consideration to note is: Matthew links the passage of "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that stonest . . ." with the saying of the Wisdom of God. Luke places this saying in xiii: 34. It is Matthew who shows that they belong together. To ascribe the saying to the historic Jesus as such would make it somewhat meaningless in the light of our present accounts of Jesus' ministry. As Montefiore points out, the historic Jesus could not have said, "O Jerusalem . . . *how often* would I." Further, he could not have lamented over the prophets whom the Jews had murdered.²⁹ However, to Christ speaking as the Wisdom of God the sayings become intelligible. Wisdom has been constantly rebuffed by Jerusalem, yea even Israel, when she would have *often* taken them into her arms. It is the eternal plaint of Wisdom throughout all the ages. In the mind of Q it is this Wisdom identified in Jesus Christ who speaks these *logia*.

The third Synoptic passages bearing on our problem are those of Matthew xi: 19 and Luke vii: 35.

And Wisdom is justified by her works. (Matt. xi: 19)

And Wisdom is justified by her children. (Luke vii: 35)

Of the two versions the Lucan is considered to be the original. Wisdom is personified as in the Wisdom literature. She is an agent

²⁸ C. G. Montefiore, Vol. II, p. 483.

²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 305.

of God's creative work and an instrument of divine revelation. As such she is welcomed by her children. Her children are not the wise, but those who have heard her voice. She is identified in this passage with the person of Christ. In the context of the passage the word seems to flow from the very lips of Jesus. He is defending His actions against the charges of the Pharisees. He answers them by declaring: "Wisdom is justified by her children." Such a defense can only be explained by supposing Wisdom stands for Himself.³⁰

At this point let us draw together our present Synoptic findings. All of them come from the Q document. One of the fundamental aspects of Q Christology is that Jesus is Revealer and Teacher. In setting forth this aspect of our Lord, Q presents the material in Matthew xi: 25-30 in the form of a Wisdom hymn. The subject, contents, and rhythmic structure are precisely those of existing hymns to the praise of the Wisdom of God. In the other passages quoted, the source Q identifies Christ with the Wisdom of God. In this respect Q upholds the testimony of the *Testimonies Against the Jews*.

There is another passage on the person of Christ in Mark xiii: 31-32 which is significant:

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

This passage is repeated in an exact duplicate in Matthew xxiv: 35-36. In this *logion* the use of the terms Father and Son is distinctly similar to their use in Matthew xi: 25-27 and Luke x: 21-22. The terms are used in the absolute sense, and in the very manner which characterizes the Fourth Gospel. There is the same mystical and strong emphasis upon the term "knoweth." That there is implied a unique relationship between the Father and the Son is indubitable. Thus from the sources of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John this usage of "Father and Son" as an expression of the consciousness of Christ is as strongly supported as any other.

³⁰ R. F. Horton, *Book of Proverbs*, p. 119.

Further, it is interesting to note the consciousness of Jesus pertaining to the validity and eternal durability of His words: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Such a consciousness was that of the wise men of Israel. In Ecclesiasticus xxxix: 9 the consciousness of the eternal survival of the words of the wise is set forth:

And so long as the world endureth, it shall not be blotted out:
His memorial shall not depart,
And his name shall live from generation to generation.

The fact that these two verses in Matthew and Mark appear together—one concerning the "eternalness" of the words of Jesus and the other concerning a Sonship in a unique and absolute sense—presents an aspect of the person of Christ that bears a distinct stamp of what may be termed Johannine tradition.

Relative to the comparison of Proverbs viii and the Prologue of John, the purpose of the preceding sections has been a definite one. Before such a comparison could be made, it was felt that a definite *historical* link between the two must be established. Otherwise, such a comparison would be mere phantasy. Thus we have seen how the thread of the Wisdom of God wove itself into Hebrew thought in the Old Testament and Apocrypha. Further, we have considered the evidences of a strand of early Christian tradition which identified Jesus Christ with the Wisdom of God. *The great and original contribution of John was to sum it all up in the common term Logos.*

IV

The Fourth Gospel is not a biography of Jesus Christ. Such was not the objective of John. Using the method of the Synoptic writers, John has caught up certain of the *logia* of Jesus which had come home to him as being of special and profound importance. Concerning the historicity of such *logia*, the tendency of modern scholarship is to attach to them more and more weight. As John appears to have a tradition of events independent of the Synoptics, it would be strange if this tradition did not include some sayings as well.⁸¹ These mystical sayings of Christ and of His person

⁸¹ B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

which he chose must have some connection with historical utterances because He is trying to show that the *Logos* Christ is an historical figure.³² What the Jesus of history actually did and said is of paramount importance to the writer of His message.

Thus John's selection of sayings, miracles, and events were determined largely by the object or idea of his gospel.³³ In the Prologue the idea was set forth. Jesus Christ in His human manifestations was a manifestation in space and time of that Eternal *Logos* that had been with God from the beginning. This Eternal *Logos* had cried out to men through the world from the beginning to be their guide, and now in the fullness of time, this Eternal *Logos* took flesh, dwelt among men, and spoke to them. Further, the mission of this Eternal *Logos* in the flesh was to impart life. That life was imparted to men only by union with Him.

Turning to the fundamental idea of Wisdom in Proverbs viii, we find: Wisdom existed before the world with God. Through her the worlds were made. She had cried out to men from the beginning of the world to be their guide. Her special "mission" was to impart life. That life was imparted to men by their accepting her and allying themselves with her.

Thus do John and the writer of Proverbs viii introduce their characters and the mission of each to us. Wherein they are similar and wherein they differ is the problem which now confronts us. Let us first consider their similarities, and secondly, their differences.

The first similarity is that of structure. Both of these passages are hymns. Proverbs viii belongs to the lyric wisdom literature. The Wisdom hymns of Ecclesiasticus xxiv: 1-22 and of the Wisdom of Solomon vii: 25-viii: 1 are based on the same pattern and thought as Proverbs viii. In the same way the *Logos* concept of John is placed in the form of a hymn. The Prologue is a poetical hymn to the *Logos*.³⁴ The Hebraic style of the hymn is predomi-

³² H. Bulcock, *Religion and Its New Testament Expressions*, p. 135.

³³ E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 1-28; J. Huby, *The Church and the Gospels*, p. 184.

³⁴ C. F. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 40; J. H. Bernard, *op. cit.*, p. cxliv; C. Cryer, *Expository Times*, Vol. XXXII, No. 10, p. 440.

nant.³⁵ According to Driver the hymn contains a rhythm that appears only in the lofty and elevated poetry of the Hebrews.³⁶

The fact that our passages are both in the literature of Hebrew poetical hymns is significant. Whether the Prologue was in itself a hymn to Wisdom as R. Harris maintains, is uncertain. However, the Prologue can keep its literary structure when the term Wisdom takes the place of the *Logos*. "And what is more important, the Prologue keeps its sense when the alteration is made."³⁷

The second similarity is that of mysticism. God has used "divers manners" to make known His revelations. Of these "divers manners" there are two outstanding types. There is the messenger type. In this group belong the prophets. They receive directly from God a revelation and then must go into the world and impart it. Like Amos, they prophesy because they must. "Jehovah hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" (Amos iii: 8). The prophets go out into the highways of the world and cry, "Thus saith Jehovah." It is authoritative revelation for everybody. In the Christian world it is that type of revelation in which the Roman Catholic Church and others have anchored themselves.

The second type may be called the personal or individual type. God is constantly revealing Himself. That revelation you receive for yourself. In so far as he is able, a man receives his own. To a certain extent this type is comparable to the Inner Light of the Quakers. The revelation of the sages was of this kind. It was God seeking each man through the Divine Reason or Wisdom of the World. From the Book of Proverbs we know that there was a large class which preferred this type of revelation to that of the prophets.

To John, Christ was "the Light that lighteth every man" (i:9). To each of us He (the Light) comes. In so far as we see Him and are able to receive Him, Christ comes into our lives and we into His. Thus each man can know Him for himself. The significance of this aspect of John's mysticism has been capably stated by Inge: "There is room for the experience of the church to throw

³⁵ On the Hebraic composition of the hymn see C. F. Burney, *op. cit.*, pp.

40-3.

³⁶ S. R. Driver, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 363.

³⁷ V. Burch, *Jesus Christ and His Revelation*, p. 97.

light on the Gospels. The historical records bear not the whole weight of the church's faith. The church's faith rests also on the experience of the light known by each. John never calls his body of teaching a knowledge. . . . Never once does he corroborate his narrative by 'witnesses' in his own generation: the witnesses on whom he relies are his readers themselves, most of them yet unborn, and the never silent voice of the Spirit of Truth in their hearts."³⁸

Such is an aspect of the mysticism of Proverbs viii. The author had very little use for a body of knowledge or revelation such as that deposited by the prophets. He had nothing to say about the fixed revelation of the Law. He preferred the individual revelation. God, through the Divine Wisdom, was calling out in the world to all men. She had no favorites. In so far as each man saw her and heard her voice, and received her, the Divine Wisdom came into his life, and he into hers.

Again, a second aspect of the mysticism of John and of Proverbs viii is that of union: the union of believers and Jesus—the union of believers (followers) and Wisdom. Union with Christ is eternal life. This is a "cardinal idea" of the Prologue.³⁹ Some of the great "union" passages in the gospel are i: 12-13; vi: 51, 53-57; xiv: 20; xv: 5; xvii: 23. "The Fourth Gospel may be said to culminate in this magnificent conception of God himself eternally present in the believer, through Christ who unites us with himself as he is united with God."⁴⁰

In the same manner life can be imparted to him who unites himself with the Divine Wisdom (Prov. viii: 32-36). Listen to the teaching of the natural world, identify yourself with it. It is the teaching of the Divine Wisdom. This is her plea. Whoever does this finds life and the favor of God. Thus to the writer of Proverbs viii the union of Wisdom and her followers is that of natural harmony. To the mind of the writer, ethical harmony and natural harmony were the same. It is all that is implied in our "modern" phrase "being in tune with the Infinite." Only by such a union and harmony can men know life.

³⁸ W. R. Inge, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

³⁹ G. H. C. Macgregor, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁴⁰ Quoted in G. H. C. Macgregor, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

The similarity of hymn structure and type of mysticism are the bones around which the substance and ideas of each passage are shaped. In considering the latter we shall present the problems under three heads.

First, let us consider the relationship of the *Logos* of John's Prologue and the Wisdom of Proverbs viii *to God*. To John, Christ is identified as the *Logos* who existed in the very beginning (i: 1a, 2a). In Proverbs viii: 25-31 "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, before the earth was." Wisdom existed as a personality before the worlds. She was older than "the hills" and not only the hills but the very "atoms" themselves (26).

Not only were Wisdom and the *Logos* preexistent, but they were with God. "The *Logos* was with God" (ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν). The *Logos* was a separate personality from the Father, Wisdom also was "a personality existing alongside of God, but separate from Him."⁴¹ She was with God. She was His eternal possession; "Jehovah possessed me in the beginning of his way" (22).

Further, the relation of the *Logos* to God was an intimate one. The relation was that of the only Son "who is in the bosom of the Father" (18). The Father loved Him. The relation of Wisdom to God was an intimate one. She was with God and helped Him. She was His counsellor and adviser. Surely one must be on intimate terms with God to be His adviser. Above all, she was His joy. She sported and played before Him: "And I was daily his delight" (30). She rejoiced with Him not only during the creation of the world but also after it was finished ("Rejoicing in his habitable earth" [31]).

Hence, the idea of Wisdom as a preexistent personality, as one who lives with God and is in the closest intimacy with Him is basically the idea of John's concept of the person of Christ. He, the *Logos*, was preexistent, lived with God, and was in relationship to Him "the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father." Such an idea is foreign to Greek philosophy. Hebrew ideas of God may be materialistic, but they are always personal. In Proverbs viii "Wisdom is no mere abstract quality, no aggre-

⁴¹ W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Book of the Apocrypha*, p. 235.

gate of traditional knowledge, but is clothed with a personal life, in the closest fellowship with the Eternal, inseparably one with Him."⁴² Such is the *Logos* of John.

Secondly, let us consider the relationship of the *Logos* of John and the Wisdom of Proverbs viii *to the world itself*. John links the *Logos* with the whole creation of the world. "Through him all existence came into being, no existence came into being apart from him" (i: 2). The world was made through the *Logos*. John implies that the *Logos* was not the ultimate cause or source, but was the medium through which creation evolved. The *Logos* was "the agent of God."

In Proverbs viii the function of Wisdom was similar. Wisdom was with God at creation. Through her aid and counsel God made the world. She was God's helper. It has been maintained by some theologians that Wisdom did not aid God. Her presence at creation was an idle one. However, such an exposition does not fit in with the purpose of the writer. He desires to show the activity of Wisdom in the world. "When he traced out the foundations of the earth, then I was beside him as a master workman" (29). The Rabbis made much use of the phrase translated above as "master workman." By slight alterations in the vowels they extracted three meanings from it. The first was "pedagogue." As such, Wisdom (identified with the Torah) was the schoolmaster in the Divine household. She gave guidance and advice to her Master during the construction of the worlds. The second meaning was "pupil." Wisdom was the pupil of God. According to Rabbinic teaching, a pupil stood to his master in the filial position of a child to its father. The third meaning was "God's workman." As such, Wisdom assumed the rôle of God's servant and performed His work in the administration of the universe.⁴³

Further, not only was the task of Wisdom that of a workman in creation, but also that of a revealer of life. From the beginning she has constantly tried to reveal herself through the world to men. Her voice has always been heard in the world calling men to follow her. In John, the *Logos* has sought to reveal itself from

⁴² E. H. Plumptre, *Proverbs*, p. 522.

⁴³ J. Abelson, *Jewish Mysticism*, p. 74.

the beginning of creation. The *Logos* was lighting up the world though "the world knew Him not" (i: 10). In every age the *Logos* gave light and life to men.⁴⁴ To John, this was the preparation for the Incarnation. Hence he climaxed the revelation of the *Logos* in the world by its incarnation in Je-us Christ. The *Logos* became *σὰρξ*.

Thus the ideas of creation and of revelation in the Prologue and in Proverbs viii have a real relationship. The function of the *Logos* and of Wisdom in creation and revelation are in their fundamental essence the same. Both were partakers in creation. Both were immanent revealers of the divine plan in the workings of the world.

Thirdly, let us consider the relationship of the *Logos* in the Prologue and that of Wisdom in Proverbs viii *to men*. It is at this point a most striking kinship is apparent. According to the former the special mission of Jesus as the Incarnate *Logos* is to impart life. This life can be imparted—according to John—only by union with Christ. In Proverbs viii the special gift that Wisdom imparts to men is life. That life can be possessed only by allying oneself with her (32-36).

To John the authority of Jesus' words and mission is in the fact that He is the *Logos* Incarnate. Because He is such, He can say to men, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." One of the main purposes in the opening lines of the Prologue is to establish the authority of Christ. Because He was in the beginning, and was divine, and became incarnate in the flesh He can give to men life. In the same manner does the writer of Proverbs viii establish the authority of Wisdom. After telling us who she is and what she offers (6-21) he states that her claims to attention are no less than that she was the eternal possession and master workman of Jehovah Himself, His joy and counsellor. Because Wisdom was there in the beginning with God and is familiar with all the mysteries of the universe, she is supremely fitted to be man's guide and instructor. That John should have used the same idea and *method*

⁴⁴ The logical implications of this were pointed out by the Apologists. Justin Martyr states: "Whatever things were rightly said among all men are the property of us Christians." *Ante Nicene Fathers* (The Second Apology), Vol. I, p. 193.

of establishing the authority of Jesus' mission and teaching as used by the writer of Proverbs viii pertaining to the status and teaching of Wisdom seems more probably due to a kinship between the Prologue and Proverbs viii than to a mere coincidence and accident.

The mission of the *Logos* Christ was to men. "This life was the light of men" (i: 4). He came into the world because He who was of the divine essence loved men. Preaching from the mountain sides and valleys, the public roads and streets Christ came appealing to all. He came into the world from the Father for the sake of men. In Proverbs viii, even though Wisdom rejoiced greatly over the material universe and all its works, her greatest joy was in "the sons of humankind" (31). She does not stay home in her seven-pillared house. Instead she goes out into the country and city places calling to men to follow her because she loves them.

The special mission of the *Logos* to men was to impart life. "In him life lay, and this life was the light of men" (i: 4). "He that believeth on me hath eternal life" is the resounding theme of the Fourth Gospel.⁴⁵ Whoever accepts Christ shall receive from Him the gift of life. At this point John's concept of judgment appears. Christ has not been sent by God to judge the world. However, men by their attitude towards Him judge themselves. This present judgment divides the sons of men into two classes—the sons of light and the sons of darkness. "The coming of Jesus into the world has compelled men to range themselves on one side or the other. . . . Previously men sinned through ignorance; they now do so by deliberate choice."⁴⁶ Thus John places his profound emphasis upon the *will*. It is not man's metaphysical frailty or littleness that separates him from the Father, but the antagonism of his will. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine" (xvii: 17). The acceptance of Christ is the condition for the gift of life. To reject Him is to neglect life and *choose* death.

In Proverbs viii the special gift of Wisdom is life. This life is none other than herself. Such a gift therefore is far above the

⁴⁵ Other significant "Life" passages are: v: 20; vi: 35, 51, 53, 56, 63, 68; x: 10; xiv: 6; xvii: 3.

⁴⁶ G. H. C. Macgregor, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-4. See also H. Odeburg, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 146.

level of earthly possessions. Great as are all her rewards such as material prosperity, intellectual eminence, and righteous honor, they are small compared to her own desirability. Wisdom's gift is Wisdom's life. At this point there is made the appeal to the moral consciousness and wills of men. All men can recognize the Divine Wisdom in the world. Hence by men's attitudes toward her they judge themselves. By their attitudes toward her, men divide themselves into two classes—the wise and the foolish. It depends upon a man's will to which of these classes he shall belong. Wisdom cries out to all. She is open to all. To seek her and find her is to choose life. To miss or reject her is to choose death.

Thus the presence of Christ in the world to John and the presence of Wisdom to the writer of Proverbs viii divide the sons of men into the sons of light and the sons of darkness, the wise and the foolish. It is the will of each individual man that determines into which class he shall go. The wise man and the son of light may say to their Wisdom and Christ:

We would watch daily before thy door,
We would wait at the doorposts of thy doorways,
For when we find thee we find life,
And obtain the favor of Jehovah.
When we sin against thee, we wrong our own souls:
When we hate thee we love death. (Prov. viii: 34-36)

The first part of our problem has considered the cardinal ideas underlying the Prologue of John and Proverbs viii. That there is a definite and intimate kinship between the spirit and ideas of both, a kinship exceeding the possibility of coincidence and chance, is the deduction of the writer. The second part of our problem is concerned with the main points of difference in each. Mainly there are two—the ideas of light and of the Incarnation.

First, the idea of light is missing in toto from Proverbs viii. This is an added idea in the Prologue. It is not by accident that the latter begins with the same words as Genesis i: 1, "In the beginning." There is a definite relationship. Paul, Luke and John made the appearance of Jesus on the earth as a new creation to be compared and connected with the first creation.⁴⁷ God's first crea-

⁴⁷ C. F. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

tive act was light. The light was in a world of natural darkness. The birth of Jesus was to Paul and John the dawn of light in a world of spiritual darkness.

In the physical creation the coming of light did not abolish the darkness. The Hebrews believed in the entity of light and darkness. Hence, in the first creation story light and darkness pursued each other across the sky. The darkness could not overtake the light nor the light overtake the darkness. The whole concept raises the interesting question: What did the Hebrews think when they blew out their "lamps"? Where did the light go?

In John the same idea is stated. Light and darkness, as separate entities, exist side by side. Neither overpowers (κατελαβεν) the other. Though the original concept was that of "overtaking" in the sense of pursuit there is little doubt that in the time of John the word commonly meant "master" or "overpower." Thus, in view of the creation story, John declared that in the Incarnation of Christ, Light shone in the world and the darkness did not conquer or master it. This concept of Light was carried into John's idea of judgment. Because the Light was in the world in Christ, men must arrange themselves on one side or the other (John iii: 19-21; ix: 39; xii: 35-36). In view of the linking of the coming of Jesus into the world with the first physical creation of light and of the using of the entity concept of light and darkness it seems probable that John's source of the idea of light is Hebraic and was founded on the Genesis story.

The second idea in which the Prologue differs fundamentally from Proverbs viii is that of the Incarnation. Only a Hebrew would have dared to express the reality of a faith in such a manner. And yet somehow it was inevitable. It is not a far cry from "And they heard the sound of Jehovah God walking in the garden in the cool of the day" to "so the *Logos* became flesh and tarried among us." In Proverbs viii Wisdom is preexistent—a fellow workman with God, the divine giver of life to all that will accept her. In the Prologue, John assigning all the attributes of the Divine Wisdom to the *Logos* goes one step further, and clothes the *Logos* in human flesh. The *Logos* becomes a real person. καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. That which was now became, and men saw it with their eyes and handled it with their hands. All chains

are broken with the philosophic past. The *Logos* Christ stands alone. Greek and Hebrew flee. He who was born at Bethlehem is the Divine *Logos*.

V

What then of our problem? Is there a real kinship—a blood heritage—between the Prologue of John and the eighth chapter of Proverbs? The answer is “yes.” It is not by chance that the theme of the *Logos* and of the Wisdom in Proverbs viii is set forth in the structure of Hebrew hymns. It is not by chance that each of the fundamental ideas of Proverbs viii is found in the Prologue of John, richer and purer. The writer of the Prologue took the moral and divine Father of the Hebrews. He took their personification of a special divine Wisdom expressed so vividly in Proverbs viii—a Wisdom begotten and with God before all things, a Wisdom that was the guide of men, and giving to that Wisdom the terminology of his day, identified it with Jesus Christ. This Wisdom now incarnated was summed up in the common term *Logos*. The way was paved for such an identification by the influence of Wisdom thought on the Hebrews themselves and by an early interpretation of Christ as the Wisdom of God.

What then of the significance of our problem? Modern scholarship upholds the validity of the relationship between the Prologue of John and the Gospel itself. The Prologue is the key to the interpretation of the Gospel. In the light of our study the key is the *Logos* Christ as the Wisdom of God. Jesus in his human manifestation was a manifestation in space and time of that Divine Wisdom who had been with God from the beginning, who had a part in the creation of the world, who cried out from that time to men through the world to be their guide, and now in the fullness of time, that Divine Wisdom had taken flesh, dwelt among men, and had spoken to them. In the light of seeing the *Logos* Christ as this Wisdom, we can understand John’s most mysterious and puzzling passages.⁴⁸ For example—“No man cometh to the Father except through me.” Surely this cannot mean that only through the intermediary of the human Jesus one can

⁴⁸ John iii:13, 35, 36; iv:14; v:17, 19, 23, 26, 30, 41; vi:35, 38, 46; viii:12, 14, 23, 28; x:1-18, 27-28, 38; xiv; xv; xvii.

come to God. Surely this does not mean that the souls before Christ and the souls after Him who have not known Him never knew the Father. The facts of human experience contradict such a statement. The facts of the Prologue itself contradict such a stand. But if these are the words of the universal preexistent Divine Wisdom of the world, they are intelligible and true. Men in all branches and ages have known and come to the Father. They have known the Father through the Divine Wisdom, speaking through the world. Now the Divine Wisdom has come in the flesh and speaks with the tongue of Jesus Christ. This is the significance of the Prologue of John to the Gospel that follows.

LAURA HULDA WILD

*Professor of History and Literature of Religion,
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley,
Massachusetts*

AN OBSERVATION UPON TYNDALE'S
LINGUISTIC GENIUS

AN OBSERVATION UPON TYNDALE'S LINGUISTIC GENIUS

By LAURA HULDA WILD

IT IS a commonplace statement to say that the King James Version of the Bible is our greatest English classic and that William Tyndale had the greatest share in producing it. For while the scholars King James gathered together consulted other versions in their compilation, Tyndale's translation had so taken possession of Englishmen's minds that they could not escape using it as the substratum of their work. In the New Testament eighty per cent of the words are Tyndale's and in some portions ninety per cent. Tyndale was martyred before he had time to complete the translation of the Old Testament and Coverdale's hand is especially apparent in the Psalms and other portions. To him is due rather than to Tyndale the preservation of the sonorous quality of the Latinisms from the Vulgate, and a polishing touch to some of Tyndale's rugged phrasing. Yet it was Tyndale who did the mining in the original Hebrew and discovered that vein of gold which it is the purpose of this paper to emphasize. It is a unique phenomenon in the history of literature that a translation from an entirely separate linguistic family should become *the* classic of another race and the most formative influence in establishing a literary standard. Just what was Tyndale's discovery which made this true as his genius penetrated into the subtle and profound meanings of human expression?

It may be futile to try to account for genius. If one has inherited a garden spot let him accept it and enjoy it. This is good advice unless one wants to know what to do to preserve the garden in its beauty. Then one inquires what the present soil needs which the old soil possessed and which has seemed to run out in attention to other things. If we wish to preserve among the common people the appreciation of our Bible, it may be well for us to rediscover one of the fundamental principles of its expression, which Tyndale found as a pioneer.

In the first place to account for Tyndale at all one must take into consideration the place and the time in which he was born. Gloucestershire in early English history was the center of many streams of linguistic influences which must have affected the making of such a man, and Gloucestershire in the fifteenth century was also feeling the stimulus for world adventure over unknown seas to new and fascinating lands. The spirit of physical prowess and investigation and of intellectual adventure may be awakened by the same stimulus. The Cabots sailed from near-by Bristol and found America. Tyndale's brain pushed out toward the Orient, through Latin and Greek and Hebrew waters, and found an affinity between the Semitic genius and his own English type of thought. In the formative years of his early boyhood Tyndale grew up just where have been found the remains of a flourishing Roman life brought in during the first century of the Christian era. The old Roman roads and military camps, the baths and villas, the layout of the streets of the city of Gloucester, the foundations of the old Roman temple at Bath, inscriptions and implements, all attest how thoroughly in this section of England the Roman had conquered the Briton. But the natives were not altogether obliterated. Some of them retreated to the west, as the Welsh language still proves, and farther back than the Britons were other Celtic branches, the Irish, the Highland Scotch, and the original Iberians also, who had settled here and were pushed to the borders by one invasion after another. Then came the Anglo-Saxon invasion, the Danes, and finally the Normans. Gloucestershire was a center for these disturbances, easy to enter with the Severn river as a waterway. It was a resourceful land and desirable, and once taken possession of was fought over and reconquered again and again. Place-names, dialects, and sectional spelling and pronunciation all show the accumulation of impressions to be traced to different linguistic sources, with remnants of early races and tongues as close neighbors.

Moreover Christianity got its start here. The old legend of Joseph of Arimathea coming to England by way of Wales and building a church of wattles in Glastonbury must have some historical fact behind it. Here St. Augustine brought in his Benedictine monks and Alfred fostered monasteries. The Abbey of Glou-

cester was famous long before the Norman conquest, and with the Normans came a revival of religious zeal and a new building era. The monasteries were very wealthy here, for it was a center of church influence, so much so that in Tyndale's day the phrase "As sure as God is in Gloucester" had become a common English proverb. With the authority of the Church had come the authority of and reverence for ecclesiastical Latin. And notwithstanding the great ignorance and gross superstition which had settled down over the clerics of Tyndale's day, yet there was a tradition of scholarship here harking back to the time of Alfred. At Berkeley Castle, only a few miles from Tyndale's home, not long before Tyndale was born, there was a scholarly chaplain by the name of John de Trevisa, who translated one of the earliest books that came off the Caxton press. He turned his hand also at translating the Bible, and inscribed passages around the walls and roof of his chapel which the boy Tyndale very likely read, for William's brother Edward has been recorded as "under receiver to his lordship of Berkley," and doubtless William had access to the grounds. Gloucester Cathedral was the home of scholars of the day, and if young Tyndale ever saw its books chained to the lectern or pored over by the monks sitting in their carrels, they must have whetted his appetite like forbidden fruit. For William was a reader, as he himself says in one of his own books, "Except my memory fail me, and that I have forgotten what I read when I was a child," etc. He was evidently a promising boy intellectually, for Foxe records that he went up to Oxford as "a child," probably admitted to the pre-university school. It seems probable that Tyndale's home was at Slimbridge. Since Magdalen College had the privilege of appointing the priest at the Slimbridge "living," may not this priest have taken an especial interest in young William, reading whatever he could lay his hands on, and recommended him to Magdalen Hall where he was entered at an early age? At Oxford, according to Foxe, "he increased in the knowledge of tongues," showing apparently an especial bent in this direction.

This then was Tyndale's linguistic inheritance. His family, supposed to have come from the north with northern speech, established their home at the very heart of England's melting-pot of languages and dialects, at the center also of churchly domi-

nance where ecclesiastical language was as familiar as the mother tongue.

But this was not all which his environment held for him. The fifteenth century was tingling with the excitement of adventure. This was the era of the breaking up of the old cosmology and geography. The old idea of the earth's surface can be seen today in the map hanging in the Hereford Cathedral, the ancient Babylonian conception of the world as a disk floating in an atmosphere called "the firmament" plus the Hebrew conception of Jerusalem as the center of the world. But now men were daring to sail the seas and discover things about the earth. Tyndale was probably about eight years old when Columbus discovered America, and when he was at Oxford, Vasco da Gama sailed from Lisbon for the East Indies. About the same time the Cabots set sail from Bristol, so near Tyndale's home, resulting in the discovery of the North American coast. Bristol was already the busiest trading center of England. Her exports of Cotswold wool and broadcloth had made her merchants wealthy. The greatest English trader of the fifteenth century, William Canynge, lived here, owning ten vessels, employing an average of eight hundred seamen, made five times mayor of the city, a great benefactor, and recognized by King Henry as his "beloved and eminent merchant of Bristol." Such merchants let in the news from the outside world and stirred ambitious youth to seek their fortune on the high seas or in foreign lands. Previous to this, foreign artisans and merchants had come to England, bringing with their wares their customs and their speech. Flemish weavers, and foreign dyers and fullers had been invited to teach the English to make more perfect cloth. The Jews had found their way thither and were exceedingly persecuted.

Copernicus was only nine years older than Tyndale, and while da Gama and the Cabots were sailing the watery deep his mind was exploring in the skies, for it was the same year Tyndale produced his translation of the Pentateuch that Copernicus finished his revolutionizing work on the Copernican theory. Only ten years before Tyndale was born, Caxton's printing press brought out the first printed book in England. Such news must have been as exciting as flying the ocean today. Moreover in 1453 the Turks had taken Constantinople and roused all Christendom with the fear of

a rival religion, and all Europe had been drawn closer together against the encroachments of the common foe.

This was the era of the Renaissance just beginning to be felt in England, when the ideals of Greek culture were being disseminated from nation to nation, when medieval narrowness of vision was breaking away and an unsurpassed freedom of spirit was being experienced. When the boy Tyndale, eager to read and eager to know, found himself at Oxford, he came under the stimulus of such scholars as Colet, Grocyn, and Linacre, fresh from Italy and enthusiastic over the new learning. Erasmus soon appeared at Oxford, attracted by Colet. This learned monk was already breaking loose from conventional churchly standards, and when he crossed the Channel again it was to publish his Greek Testament at Cambridge. Tyndale, now an Oxford M.A., having "increased in the knowledge of tongues and other liberal arts and specially in the knowledge of the Scriptures," went to Cambridge, which was much more open to the study of Greek and the new learning than was Oxford. Thus he was under the spell of adventure as much as the Cabots or Copernicus.

Once more back in Gloucestershire as chaplain and tutor to Sir John Walsh's family, his adventurous spirit caught fire when he saw the common people in their ignorance at the mercy of stupid and unprogressive priests. Like Erasmus he wished everyone could read the Gospel, and resolved they should in their own tongue, and like the greatest of his teachers in Oxford or Cambridge he was resolved to push back to the sources and come as close to the original as possible. Finding himself hampered at Little Sodbury, he went to London. Checked in London, he crossed the Channel. But already he had crossed the great gulf fixed by the Church, and left the Vulgate for the Greek text. Soon he was to brave all prejudice against the Jew, a prejudice very fierce in that day in Europe, and learn Hebrew in order to translate the Old Testament from the original. But all this does not fully account for Tyndale's translation becoming our greatest English classic. It simply accounts for the road he travelled. As he travelled it he made a great discovery. What was that discovery?¹

¹ The above facts are elaborated in Laura H. Wild, *The Romance of the English Bible*.

We are told by a noted German scholar of that day that Tyndale "was so skilled in seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, French, that whichever he spoke you would suppose it his native tongue,"² and German may well have been added to make an eighth. As country boys move on from their local surroundings to the university and into the larger cosmopolitan world of learning and languages, they usually lose their local dialect and gradually assume the diction of the scholar and the speech of the cultivated. Had it been so with Tyndale we should have found his writings and translations couched largely in words drawn from the Latin, the scholar's language, and from French and Italian, the polite languages of society. But on the contrary, the large majority of his words hark back to the Old English, to that mixture of dialects which were boiled down into his native speech. Even in his translation of the New Testament, whose texts were in Latin and Greek, it is startling to find so large a proportion of Old English derivatives as compared with Latin and Greek. It is true he was translating for the common people of England, that they might read in the tongue they understood. But it is true also that he was teaching them a better speech, was unconsciously setting a standard of expression that has become our classic. Moreover the common people were not unfamiliar with the Latin of the priests, and Latin derivatives would not have struck their ears as strange and out of place. But he chose instinctively the forceful, graphic, suggestive phrases of his native tongue. This is even more evident in his own writings, where he was not bound to any text but expressing his own ideas and feelings spontaneously and for the educated, as, for example, in his answers to Sir Thomas More and his apologue to the Pentateuch.

As evidence of this let us examine two familiar passages in the New Testament and one each from the above mentioned writings. In Matt. vi: 9-13, The Lord's Prayer, we find 39 different words and forms of words from Old English, 4 from Middle English, and only 3 from Latin and 1 from Greek derivation. That is, more than nine-tenths of the words are from distinctively English origin, going back to the Old Saxon, Old Frisian, and Old

² Herman Buschius.

Norse dialects. In 1 Cor. xiii: 1-13 out of the 119 different words and forms, 76 are derived from Old English, 9 from Middle English, and 24 from Latin, or Greek by way of Latin, many of the latter coming through Old French. In other words, over seven-tenths of the number are from definitely English extraction. Moreover, these selections are taken from Tyndale's revised edition of 1534, when he had had the time to work over his translation more carefully and leave it as he wished upon slow reflection. Bishop Westcott says: "The very minuteness of the changes is a singular testimony to the diligence with which Tyndale still labored at his appointed work. Nothing seemed trifling to him, we may believe, if only he could better seize or convey to others the meaning of one fragment of Scripture."³

Turning to a brief extract from his reply to Sir Thomas, beginning "And in like manner it is that thousands," etc., we find that here of 62 separate words and forms we have 44 from Old English, 9 from Middle English, 1 straight from the Old Norse, and only 8 from Latin, one of these coming from the Greek. That is, almost nine-tenths are from his native tongue. And once more from the first paragraph of his preface to the Pentateuch, we find of 103 different words and forms, 72 Old English, 10 Middle English, 1 straight from the Old Saxon, and 2 from French, while only 17 came from Latin derivation and 1 from Greek. Therefore here again the far larger proportion, over eight-tenths, are from English, and this was in his later years of writing, when his knowledge of the seven foreign languages was most perfect. To be sure, such a radical scholar as Tyndale was criticized, called unscholarly and charged with imitation, even of copying Luther. But while doubtless he was greatly influenced by Luther, using him in his prologues, marginal references and notes, these charges of dependence in translation of the text itself have been convincingly refuted, and Tyndale's repute established as one of the pioneer research linguists.⁴

³ *A General View of the History of the English Bible* (1916), p. 145.

⁴ See Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, p. 133 f.; Henry Guppy, *A Brief Sketch of the History of the Transmission of the Bible*, pp. 36, 37; and Laura H. Wild, *The Romance of the English Bible*, p. 132.

When we come to Tyndale's translation of the Old Testament we are at the final stage in his career. Now his most mature judgment as a translator should be seen. If his first enthusiasm over giving the English common people a text in their own dialect had outrun the good sense of truthful translation, here it would naturally be corrected by such an honest and painstaking scholar, and we would find a more even balance in his derivatives. Therefore we take two extracts from his Pentateuch. The first is Gen. xxii: 1-6. Of the 82 separate words or forms, 63 are of Old English origin, 9 Middle English, 3 directly from the Old Saxon, 4 from Old French, 2 from Low German and only 1 from Latin. And in Deut. xxxii: 1-5, of 67 words, we find 45 go back to Old English, 10 to Middle English, 2 straight to Old Saxon, 3 to Old French and 7 are of Latin derivation. The proportion here of words of early English origin is seen to be even larger than in the New Testament.

And now we come to the main point of our observation. Tyndale wrote concerning his work: "They will say it cannot be translated into our tongue, it is so rude. It is not so rude as they are false liars. For the Greek tongue agreeth more with the English than with the Latin, and the properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than with the Latin. The manner of speaking is both one; so that in a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into English, word for word; when thou must seek a compass in the Latin, and yet shall have much work to translate it well-favorably, so that it have the same grace and sweetness, sense and understanding with it in the Latin as it hath in the Hebrew."⁵ Tyndale's knowledge of Greek was largely New Testament Greek, and this we must remember bears the stamp of Hebraic thought. Both New Testament passages examined above are in the original really Hebrew poems written in the Greek tongue. His knowledge of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was not so perfect as that of modern scholars, for the earliest texts were not then available and scholarship has advanced. But he got back to the original as closely as he could, and somehow his linguistic intuition told him there was a

⁵ From the preface to *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, edited by the Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848.

remarkable affinity between the Hebrew expression and his own English type of speech. The Old Testament, the especial gift to us of the Hebrew mind, is peculiarly graphic and symbolic, and the New Testament, in so far as it is cast in that Hebraic mold, gives us the same type of expression. Figures of speech abound, metaphors, similes, parables, allegories, onomatopoeia, rhythmic phrasing according to the principles of parallelism are the basis of their language, a poetic, symbolic intuition of spiritual truth rather than philosophic, argumentative reasoning. Spiritual truth can as a matter of fact best get itself understood symbolically. If we are to speak of the inner experiences of life at all, it must be by likening them to sense experiences. Thus we have a stiff-necked generation as a synonym for pride, and a man stretching forth his hands as an expression of prayer. The commonest Hebrew words for spiritual and moral acts were symbolic words. If one decided anything, he cut the thing in two; if he obeyed, he simply heard God's voice. Jesus' parables are models of the most penetrating moral teaching.

This original derivation of words denoting spiritual and moral ideas from sense perceptions is of course true of Latin and Greek and other languages, but by the time these classic words reached the English tongue they had been so long used to express abstractions that they had lost much of their symbolism. This is true in the history of Roman Latin, and among English derivatives the period of ecclesiastical Latin was the period of the adoption of the very large majority of Latinisms.⁶ Archbishop Trench called attention to the original figurative meaning of many such words, such as "revelation" and "absolution," urging students to go back and find it, but he speaks of "the long Latin words which, with all our desire to use all plainness of speech, we yet cannot do without," making evident that the native English is plainer, and that the road back to Latin symbolism is a long one.⁷ Professor Wyld has said that one "characteristic feature of Old English is the existence of a peculiar and highly developed poetic diction. Not only is there a large number of words whose use is confined

⁶ For a list of these words see Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology*, Chap. XXI.

⁷ Trench, *A Study of Words* (New York, 1855), p. 229.

to poetry, but we find a most elaborate system of metaphorical expressions and roundabout ways of referring to such things as the sea, the sun, ships, the sky, battle, a prince, a sword, the human body and so on."⁸

We find in our English speech the crisp suggestiveness of Old English derivatives so surprising that it often suddenly quickens our apathetic minds, and a smile breaks out on our faces at the subtle humor of comparison and contrast. Even the solemn and most earnestly affectionate letter of Tyndale to his friend John Fryth would lose its pungent quality if other words had been chosen: "Dearly beloved brother Jacob, I guessed long ago that God would send a dazing into the head of spirituality, to be caught themselves in their own subtlety; and I trust it is come to pass. And now methinketh I smell a Council to be taken—Wherefore cleave fast." And in the verbal battle between "the gentle, saintly, and learned Sir Thomas More"⁹ and plain William Tyndale who bore no titles, the raciness of speech on each side is due largely to Old English derivatives, but more so in Tyndale's words.

Sir Thomas: "Judge, good Christian reader, whether it be possible that he be any better than a beast, out of whose brutish beastly mouth cometh such a filthy foam of blasphemies against Christ's holy ceremonies and blessed sacraments."

Tyndale: "In like manner it is, that thousands, while the priest pattereth St. John's gospel in Latin over their heads, cross themselves with, I trow, a legion of crosses, behind and before, and (as Jack-of-Napes, when he claweth himself) pluck up their legs, and cross so much as their heels and the very soles of their feet, and believe that if it be done in the time that he readeth the gospel (and else not) that there shall no mischance happen them that day, because only of those crosses."

Tyndale as he studied in the early sixteenth century felt the likeness between Hebrew and English, but it took a Herder in the latter part of the eighteenth century to see the reasons for it. With great discrimination and appreciation of the beauty of

⁸ H. C. Wyld, Professor of English Language at Oxford, in article on "English Language" in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 14th ed.

⁹ *idem*, *History of Modern Colloquial English* (London, 1920), p. 104.

Greek and Italian, he picked out the essential qualities which make northern languages more akin to Hebrew and other oriental languages. "The language of the former" (i.e. Greek), he says, "abounds in full and sonorous vowel sounds and that of the latter [Italian] with diphthongs, both of which are uttered not with the lips compressed together, but *ore rotundo*. The accents of the East are uttered forth more *ab imo pectore*, and from the heart. . . ? . When the lips are opened the utterance is full of animation, and bodies forth the form of things, while it is giving vent to feeling, and this, it appears to me, is the spirit of the Hebrew language. It is the very breath of the soul. It does not claim the beauty of sound like the Greek, but it breathes and lives."¹⁰ Herder is speaking here of the spoken language, of Hebrew pronunciation and its gutturals. He says: "Homer's most sounding lines do not creak and hiss, they are sonorous. The words have passed through a refining process." And again: "All northern languages imitate the sounds of natural objects, but roughly. . . . Like the objects they imitate they abound with creaking, and rustling, and whizzing, and crashing sounds." This is what Tyndale referred to in his rather touchy remark, "They will say it cannot be translated into our tongue it is so rude," and when he declares it has "the same grace and sweetness, sense and understanding" he means the same as Herder's "very breath of the soul" plus the musical quality of its phrasing. Tyndale's version was rough in many spots, but it was graphic and rhythmical.

It has been said recently in discussing the period of the Renaissance that "sculpture, architecture, even literature, were hampered and restrained by Greek and Latin models, and could not work out their destiny with untrammelled freedom. You have to pass over into Spain and into England to find the Renaissance joy of this world in its highest national literary expression, and the drama of Shakespeare and his fellows is perhaps an even more perfect interpretation of the Renaissance spirit than is the painting of Italy."¹¹ William Tyndale was a forerunner of Shakespeare and his fellows. Unlike them he felt embarrassed and ham-

¹⁰ J. G. Herder, *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (English translation, 1833), pp. 33-5.

¹¹ Gamaliel Bradford, *Saints and Sinners* (1932), p. 13.

pered socially, the joy of this world was not present even in his writings, for "in the wily subtilties of this world he was simple and inexpert and, radical as he was, his morality was stiff." But when it came to expressing himself verbally, his spirit was free and the creative power of his English genius paved the way for later writers, for he saw the possibilities of his mother tongue in his English Bible so eagerly read, so impossible of suppression. He saw the affinity between the Hebrew and the English, and performed a marriage rite between the two. The result was not a mere translation, it was the formation of an English classic.

It is to be profoundly regretted, from the literary standpoint, to say nothing of the religious, that the present generation is comparatively unfamiliar with Biblical phraseology. Not only have our young people lost the stories and parables, but the pithy sayings and adroit turns of expression which have made the Bible a most valuable household help in the education of children. Moreover the deep spiritual significance of Biblical poetry and symbolism has held strength and renewing power for men and women in the struggles of mature life, just because they learned those passages at the age of clear impression and easy memory. This literary and religious loss in our education has been especially marked within the last fifteen years.

To bring the Bible again to public attention as a live, people's book, not merely a religious classic, a number of earnest and devoted scholars have put their attention upon translations into the people's language. Some very gratifying results have been accomplished. Modern scholarship has been made use of freely, and yet the stiffness and pedanticism of the Revised Version has been avoided. An appreciation of the fact that the original authors were writing spontaneously out of their experience for the common folk has led these translators to search for words and phrases which would be meaningful to the ordinary people of today. However, it is with regret that we find no translation possessing the minds of this generation. Many enjoy the freshness of the new phraseology and use these versions as good commentaries, but none of them grip and satisfy as the King James version did for two centuries, and there is such a variety of texts that one is puzzled to know which one to memorize.

We have been greatly enlightened by what historical research has done for the Bible, but has our appreciation of its highest literary and religious qualities of poetic symbolism been waning? We have been duly impressed by the fact that we ourselves are passing through a Renaissance period and that America is the melting-pot of nations. We have been awakening to our own creative possibilities in literature and to the changing process in our own speech. Are we evolving new standards and better?

Professor de Sélincourt, who seems to know both sides of the Atlantic, encourages Americans by saying that "the conditions under which English is spoken in the United States (where it is only one language among many) have a great deal in common with those out of which it originally grew, and are certain to produce a flow of novel words and novel devices, some of which will remain to enrich and renovate our speech." And again in speaking of the English people, he thinks "the English practical man is poetically practical . . . his genius is at its best when his occupation is richest in vital analogies."¹² But notwithstanding this hopeful note, one must query as to just where our language as well as our Bible is going. As to the Bible, we are quite sure the revisers of the '80's paid little heed to the discovery of William Tyndale, and while modern translators have tried in many places to retain the rhythm of Hebrew parallelism, many of the jarring spots in the new versions are due to an exchange of Old English derivatives for Latinisms. Just why "realm" should have been substituted for "kingdom" in the Lord's Prayer is not clear, even though kings are passing. And is "revered" better than "hallowed"? In Paul's poem on love, does "distribute all I possess in charity" come as close home as "give all my goods to feed the poor" or "love never disappears" as "never faileth" or "the imperfect will be superceded" as "that which is in part will be done away?" We wonder if it betters the text to translate the Hebrew "Yahweh" by "the Eternal" instead of "the Lord," or to displace the Old English "grass" by "vegetation" and "land" by "district." Is it more effective for Abraham to have "harnessed" his ass than to have "saddled" him, for God to "designate" one of the hills

¹² Basil de Sélincourt, *Pomona, or The Future of English*.

than to "show" him a mountain? to say that Abraham "raised his eyes and saw the place in the distance" than that "he lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off"? Is it more to the point for Abraham to say that "I and the boy go yonder to perform our devotions after which we shall return to you" than "I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you"?¹³

That these changes have not all been made in the interests of scholarly accuracy is manifest, for the translators themselves do not agree as to which words should be changed. One likes "to worship" rather than "to perform our devotions." Another sticks to "the Lord" rather than "the Eternal," and a third, while he "reveres" the Father's name, prays that his "kingdom" may come. These scholars have indeed succeeded in making many enlightening as well as novel turns of expression, but did they have Tyndale's discovery constantly in mind? Would it not be possible to so revise Tyndale's text that the archaisms and inaccuracies might be eliminated while retaining that close affinity between the Hebrew and Old English symbolism? Then perhaps we might have a text of literary quality, which all would be glad to teach their children to memorize.

William Tyndale's fame has rested truly in large measure upon the moral quality of the man who faced the stake and whose Testaments were burned. But the permanence of his achievement for humanity lies in his remarkable linguistic intuition, and his unique discovery as he set to work to translate the Bible into his native English tongue.

¹³ These examples have been taken from Moffatt's and Goodspeed's translations and the American Old Testament. It is to be observed that "love" instead of "charity" is Tyndale's word restored. Note what he says in his answer to More: "He rebuketh me also that I translate this Greek word ἀγάπη into *love*, and not rather into *charity*, so holy and so known a term. Verily *charity* is no known English in that sense which ἀγάπη requireth," etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF
DUNCAN B. MACDONALD

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF DUNCAN B. MACDONALD

BOOKS

- 1903 *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, New York (Charles Scribner's Sons), ix, 386 p.
- 1905 Edited "A Selection from the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldun, with Notes and an English-German Glossary," No. IV in *Semitic Study Series*, Leiden (Brill).
- 1909 *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*, Being the Haskell Lectures on Comparative Religion, delivered before the University of Chicago in 1906, ix, 317 p. Chicago (University of Chicago Press).
- 1911 *Aspects of Islam*, ix, 375 p. New York (The Macmillan Company).
- 1912 *The Arabic and Turkish Manuscripts in the Newberry Library*, 18 p. Chicago (The Newberry Library).
- 1916 *The Presentation of Christianity to Moslems*, 142 p. New York (Board of Missionary Preparation).
- The Hebrew Literary Genius—An Interpretation*, Being an Introduction to the Reading of the Old Testament. To be published this year.

ARTICLES CONTRIBUTED TO BOOKS

- 1903 English Translation of the Notes in *Sacred Books of the Old Testament in Colors*, Part XV: "The Book of Proverbs," by A. Müller and E. Kautzsch.
- 1905 "Ibn al-'Assāl's Arabic Version of the Gospels," in *Homenaje A. D. Francisco Codera*, pp. 375-92. Zaragoza, Madrid.
- 1906 "The Story of the Fisherman and the Jinni," transcribed from Galand's MS. of the "Thousand and One Nights" in *Orientalische Studien*, Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag, Band I, pp. 357-83. Gieszen.
- 1908 "A MS. of Abū Hiffān's Collection of Anecdotes about Abū Nuwwās," in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, pp. 351-8. Chicago (University of Chicago Press).
- 1909 "Semitic Philology," in *Recent Christian Progress: Studies in Christian Thought and Work during the Last Seventy-five Years*, by Professors and Alumni of Hartford Theological Seminary, pp. 1-8. Edited by L. B. Paton. New York (The Macmillan Company).
- 1915 Concluding Study in *The Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam*, pp. 215-39. Oxford University Press. Reprinted from *International Review of Missions*, October 1913, pp. 657-73.

ARTICLES IN "THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS,"
EDITED BY JAMES HASTINGS

- 1908 Allah. Vol. I, pp. 326 *f*.
1910 Baptism (Muhammadan). Vol. II, pp. 409 *f*.
Blessedness (Muhammadan). Vol. II, pp. 677-80

ARTICLES IN "ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA," ELEVENTH EDITION

- 1910 Abu Hanifa. Vol. I, pp. 78 *f*.
Ahmad ibn Hanbal. Vol. I, pp. 430 *f*.
Bairam. Vol. III, pp. 223 *f*.
Bukhari. Vol. IV, pp. 770 *f*.
Cadi. Vol. IV, p. 928
Dervish. Vol. VIII, p. 75
Divan. Vol. VIII, p. 325
Imam. Vol. XIV, p. 331
Mahommedan Institutions. Vol. XVII, pp. 411-14
Mahommedan Law. Vol. XVII, pp. 414-17
Malik Ibn Anas. Vol. XVII, p. 489
Mufti. Vol. XVIII, pp. 955 *f*.
Muslim Ibn al Hajjaj. Vol. XIX, p. 93
Ramadan. Vol. XXII, p. 872
Rum or Roum. Vol. XXIII, p. 825
Shafi'i. Vol. XXIV, p. 759
Ulema. Vol. XXVII, p. 565
1929 *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, fourteenth edition:
Thousand and One Nights. Vol. XXII, pp. 157-9

ARTICLES IN "A NEW STANDARD BIBLE DICTIONARY," EDITED BY
M. W. JACOBUS, E. E. NOURSE, AND E. C. ZENOS

- 1909-1926 Arab, Arabia, Arabians, p. 58
Aramaic Language, pp. 60-2
Ecclesiastes, pp. 195 *f*.
Job, pp. 455-7

ARTICLES CONTRIBUTED TO THE LEYDEN "ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM"

- 1913 'Abd al-Razzāk. Vol. I, pp. 61-3
Allāh. Vol. I, pp. 302-11
Baibars, the Romance of. Vol. I, pp. 589 *f*.
Ba'l. Vol. I, pp. 610 *f*.
Bal'am. Vol. I, p. 613
Baršīšā. Vol. I, pp. 667 *f*.
Bid'a. Vol. I, pp. 712 *f*.
Budūh. Vol. I, pp. 770 *f*.
Buhlūl. Vol. I, pp. 772 *f*.
Damīrī. Vol. I, p. 912
Dār al-ḥarb. Vol. I, pp. 917 *f*.

- 1913 Dār al-Islām. Vol. I, p. 918
Dār al-ṣulḥ. Vol. I, p. 919
Dawsa. Vol. I, p. 933
Derwīsh. Vol. I, pp. 949-51
Dhikr. Vol. I, p. 958
Dhimma. Vol. I, pp. 958 *f.*
Dīn. Vol. I, p. 975
al-Djabartī. Vol. I, p. 986
Djafr. Vol. I, pp. 994 *f.*
Djā'iz. Vol. I, p. 1003
Djihād. Vol. I, pp. 1041 *f.*
Djinn. Vol. I, pp. 1045 *f.*
1927 al-Faḍālī. Vol. II, pp. 35 *f.*
Faḳīh. Vol. II, p. 46
Faḳīr. Vol. II, p. 46
Fa'l. Vol. II, pp. 46 *f.*
Fatwā. Vol. II, pp. 92 *f.*
Firāsa. Vol. II, p. 108
Firdaws. Vol. II, p. 110
Fiṭra. Vol. II, pp. 115 *f.*
Ghaib. Vol. II, p. 135
Ghaiba. Vol. II, p. 135
Ghawth. Vol. II, pp. 145 *f.*
al-Ghazālī. Vol. II, pp. 146-9
Ghūl. Vol. II, pp. 165 *f.*
Ḥaḍra. Vol. II, p. 207
Ḥaḳīka. Vol. II, pp. 223 *f.*
Ḥaḳḳ. Vol. II, pp. 225 *f.*
Ḥāl. Vol. II, p. 227
al-Ḥamdala. Vol. II, pp. 245 *f.*
Hātif. Vol. II, p. 289
Ḥikāya. Vol. II, pp. 303-5
Ḥizb. Vol. II, pp. 322 *f.*
Ibn al 'Assāl. Vol. II, p. 364
Idjmā'. Vol. II, p. 448
Idjtihād. Vol. II, pp. 448 *f.*
'Ifrit. Vol. II, p. 455
Iḳtibās. Vol. II, p. 463
Ilāh. Vol. II, p. 464
Ilhām. Vol. II, pp. 467 *f.*
'Ilm. Vol. II, pp. 469 *f.*
Imān. Vol. II, pp. 474 *f.*
In shā' Allāh. Vol. II, p. 511
'Isā. Vol. II, pp. 524-6

- 1927 I'tikād. Vol. II, p. 564
 Ḳaḍā. Vol. II, pp. 603 f.
 Ḳadar. Vol. II, p. 605
 Ḳadariya. Vol. II, pp. 605 f.
 Kalām. Vol. II, pp. 670-5
 Kalīm Allah. Vol. II, p. 699
 Kalima. Vol. II, p. 699
 Karāma. Vol. II, p. 744
 Ḳarīn. Vol. II, p. 763
 Ḳarūn. Vol. II, pp. 780 f.
 Kasb. Vol. II, pp. 785 f.
 Kashf. Vol. II, pp. 787 f.
 Ḳiṣṣa. Vol. II, pp. 1042-4
 Ḳiyāfa. Vol. II, pp. 1047 f.
 Ḳiyāma. Vol. II, pp. 1048-51
 1928 Al-Mahdī. Vol. III, pp. 111-15
 1929 Malāḥim. Vol. III, pp. 188 f.
 Malā'ika. Vol. III, pp. 189-92
 1931 Mātūrīdī. Vol. III, p. 414
 1925 Samā'. Vol. IV, pp. 12 f.
 1927 Shu'ūbiya. Vol. IV, p. 395
 Ṣifa. Vol. IV, p. 406
 Siḥr. Vol. IV, pp. 409-17
 Ṣimiyā'. Vol. IV, pp. 425 f.
 1929 Taklif. Vol. IV, p. 631
 Tawhīd. Vol. IV, p. 704
 1932 'Ulamā'. Vol. IV, p. 994

ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- 1893 "The Gospels in Arabic," *Hartford Seminary Record*, pp. 163-76;
 Addenda, p. 252.
 1894 "The Müller Semitic Library," *Hartford Seminary Record*, Vol. IV,
 February, pp. 174-9.
 1895 "Faith of Islam," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 93-117.
 "Notes, Critical and Lexicographical," *Journal of Biblical Literature*,
 pp. 57-62.
 "The Original Form of the Legend of Job," *Journal of Biblical Literature*,
 pp. 63-71.
 1897 "Faith of Islam," Additions to l. 13 of p. 117 of this article (1895),
American Journal of Semitic Languages, January, pp. 140-1.
 "Masoretic Use of the Article as a Relative," *American Journal of*
Semitic Languages, pp. 213 f.
 1898 "Some External Evidence on the Original Form of the Legend of
 Job," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 137-64.
 1899 "The Interchange of Sibilants and Dentals in Semitic," *American*
Journal of Semitic Languages, pp. 100-4.

- 1899 "Job and Muslim Cosmography," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 168 f.
 "The Life of al-Ghazzālī," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XX, pp. 71-132.
 "Old Testament Notes," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, pp. 212-15.
- 1900 "The Development of Muslim Jurisprudence," Inaugural Address, *Hartford Seminary Record*, pp. 227-53.
 "The Emancipation of Slaves under Moslem Law," *The Review of Reviews*, pp. 328 f.
- 1901 "Emotional Religion in Islām as affected by Music and Singing," being a translation of a book of the *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* of al-Ghazzālī, with analyses, annotations and appendices, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Part I, April, pp. 195-252; Part II, October, pp. 705-48.
- 1902 *ibid.*, Part III, January, pp. 1-28.
- 1904 "The Poetry of Arabia and the Ballad Problem," *The Nation*, December 29, pp. 518 f.
 "The Problem of Muhammadanism," Paper read before the International Congress of Arts and Sciences at St. Louis, September 23. Published in *The Transactions of the Congress of Arts and Sciences, Universal Exposition, St. Louis, 1904. Vol. II, Politics, Law and Religion*, pp. 518-34. Boston and New York (Houghton, Mifflin and Co.) 1906.
- 1905 Reprinted in *The Hartford Seminary Record*, February, pp. 77-97.
 "The Moral Education of the Young Among Muslims," in *International Review of Ethics*, Vol. XV, pp. 286-304.
- 1906 "On Translating the Old Testament," *The Nation*, August 23, pp. 160-1, and *New York Evening Post*, August 25.
- 1907 "MS. of Abū Hiffān's Collection of Anecdotes about Abū Nuwās," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 86-91.
- 1908 Note on "Arabic MS. of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves," *The Nation*, October 8, p. 335.
- 1909 "Maximilian Habicht and his Recension of the Thousand and One Nights," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 685-704.
- 1910 "One Phase of the Doctrine of the Unity of God with its Consequences," Annual Address at Opening of Hartford Seminary, September 22, 1909, *Hartford Seminary Record*, pp. 21-37.
 "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves, in Arabic, from a Bodleian MS.," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 327-86.
 "Lord Cromer and the Egyptian Peasantry," *The Nation*, May 26, p. 536.
- 1911 "Description of a Silver Amulet," in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Band XXVI, pp. 267-9.
- 1912 Note on "Arabian Poetry," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 448 f.

- 1913 Further Notes on "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 41-53.
"A Missing MS. of the Arabian Nights," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, p. 432.
"God, a Unit or a Unity," *The Moslem World*, January, pp. 11-20.
"Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam," *International Review of Missions*, October, pp. 657-73.
- 1916 "Begotten Not Made," *The Moslem World*, January, pp. 18-27.
Question Drawer, *The Moslem World*, January, p. 82.
"The Caliphate," *The Nation*, July 13, pp. 32-4.
"The Disruption of Islam," *The Yale Review*, October, pp. 101-16.
- 1917 "The Doctrine of Revelation in Islam," *The Moslem World*, April, pp. 112-17.
"Saint-Worship" and
"Mihrab"; Question Drawer, *The Moslem World*, pp. 212-13.
"The Caliphate," *The Moslem World*, October, pp. 349-57.
Reprinted from the *New York Nation* for July 13, 1916.
"Abrogation in Islam," *The Moslem World*, October, pp. 420-3.
"The Arabian Situation," *The Nation*, November 8, pp. 505-7.
- 1918 "Limitations of the Mystical Method in Religion," *The Constructive Quarterly*, pp. 716-38.
- 1919 "What Christianity may Add to Islam," *The Moslem World*, October (reprint of Section IX of a Report of a Committee of the Board of Missionary Preparation on *The Presentation of Christianity to Moslems*), pp. 340-51.
"From the Arabian Nights to Spirit," *The Moslem World*, October, pp. 336-48.
"The Situation in the Mohammedan World," *The Review*, August 30, pp. 339-41.
- 1920 "Constantinople and the Turks," *The Review*, April 3, pp. 325-7.
- 1922 "Wahm in Arabic and its Cognates," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 505-21.
- 1923 "Christian Literature for Moslems," *The Moslem World*, October, pp. 335-42.
"The Near East Tangle," *The Yale Review*, January, pp. 345-63.
- 1924 "Ananikian the Scholar" in *The Gotchnag*, Memorial Number, August 23, New York, p. 1065; (extracts from a letter to Mrs. Ananikian) pp. 1066-7.
"The Earlier History of the Arabian Nights," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 353-97.
- 1925 "An Outline of the History of Scholastic Theology in Islam," *The Moslem World*, April, pp. 140-55, Reprint of the Article on "Kalām" in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. II, pp. 670-5.
- 1927 "Continuous Re-Creation and Atomic Time in Moslem Scholastic Theology," in *Isis*, No. 30, Vol. IX (2), June, pp. 326-44.
- 1928 Reprinted in *The Moslem World*, January, pp. 6-28.

- 1930 "Oriental Tales," a communication to the Literary Supplement of *The Times* (London), May 15, p. 414.
- 1931 "The Development of the Idea of Spirit in Islam," in *Acta Orientalia* (Oslo), Vol. IX, pp. 307-51.
 "What About the Old Testament?" *Bulletin of the Hartford Seminary Foundation*, October, pp. 10-14.
 Editorial on "Nöldeke and Sachau," *The Moslem World*, July, pp. 221 f.
- 1932 "Lewis Bayles Paton: The Scholar in a Time of Conflict,"—*Bulletin of the Hartford Seminary Foundation*, May, pp. 15-18.
 "A Bibliographical and Literary Study of the First Appearance of the Arabian Nights in Europe," in *Library Quarterly*, the University of Chicago, Vol. II, No. 4, October, pp. 387-420.
 "The Development of the Idea of Spirit in Islam," *The Moslem World*, January and April, pp. 25-42, 153-6, Reprint from *Acta Orientalia* (Oslo), Vol. IX, 1931, pp. 307-51.
 "The Essence of Christian Missions," *The Moslem World*, October, pp. 327-30.
 Reprinted in *Southern Churchman*, October 8, p. 7.
- 1933 "Whither Islam," an editorial, *The Moslem World*, January 1-5.

UNSIGNED REVIEWS IN "THE NATION"

- Dictionary of the Bible*. Dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, edited by the Rev. J. Hastings. New York (Charles Scribner's Sons). January 10, 1901 (or 1902); August 28, 1902; November 24, 1904.
- Encyclopædia Biblica*. A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible, edited by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. London (A. & C. Black); New York (The Macmillan Company). March 29, 1900; July 18, 1901; August 28, 1902; June 25, 1903.
- The Jewish Encyclopedia*. A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature and Customs of the Jewish People, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. New York (Funk & Wagnalls Co.). October 31, 1901; October 2, 1902; February 26, 1903; June 25, 1903; December 17, 1903; May 19, 1904; December 1, 1904; April 13, 1905; November 9, 1905; June 7, 1906.
- The New International Encyclopædia*. Editors: Daniel Coit Gilman; Harry Thurston Peck; Frank Moore Colby. New York (Dodd, Mead & Co.). December 25, 1902; May 28, 1903; August 20, 1903; January 14, 1904; May 13, 1904.
- Reviews bearing on *The Arabian Nights*: February 2, 1899; August 30, 1900; September 6, 1900; November 29, 1900; December 6, 1900; May 30, 1901; December 12, 1901; May 21, 1903; December 27, 1906; January 1, 1907.

SIGNED REVIEWS

- 1893 "Gesenius Hebrew Grammar, 2nd American Edition." E. C. Mitchell and I. M. Price, Boston, 1893; "Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Part 17, Book of Job," by Paul Haupt and C. Siegfried. *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1894 Trumbull's "Oriental Social Life." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1895 Davidson's "Hebrew Syntax." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1897 "The New Study of Arabic Grammar," a review of T. Nöldeke's "Zur Grammatik des Classischen Arabisch, Wien 1896." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 310-13.
- "The Drama of Modern Arabic," a review of M. Sobernheim's edition of Moḥammad Bey 'Osmān Galāl's "Madraset el 'Azwāg." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 313-15.
- 1898 Review of W. M. Patton's "Ahmed Ibn Ḥanbal and the Mihna." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 209-11.
- G. Jacob's "Altarabische Parallelen." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 212-13.
- J. Wellhausen, "Der Arabische Josippus." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 215-16.
- 1899 Arbeeley, "Arabic Grammar." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 181-2.
- Beha-ed-Din's "The Life of Saladin," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 182-4.
- Harder's "Arabic Conversation-Grammar." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 251-3.
- Nöldeke's "Syriac Grammar." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 254-6.
- Pautz' "Muhammeds Lehre von der Offenbarung." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 173-7.
- 1901 Gibson, "Studia Sinaitica No. VIII." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 54-5.
- Brockelmann's "History of Arabic Literature." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 185-9.
- Hartmann, "Der Islamische Orient." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 189-90.
- Horovitz, "De Waqidii libro qui Kitāb al Maghāzī inscribitur." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 190-1.
- Kern, "Innisā'u-l-'ālimāt von Muhammad Bey 'Osman Galāl." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 117-18.
- S. G. Green, "Handbook to Old Testament Hebrew." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- "The American Revision of the Bible." *The Nation*, October 10.
- T. J. de Boer, "Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam." *The Nation*, October 10.
- 1902 Grünert, "Ibn Kutaiba's Adab-al-Kātib." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 126-7.

- 1902 Zettersteen, "Die Alfīje des Ibn Mu'ti." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 127-8.
 Weissenbach, "Die Arabische Nominalform Fā'ul." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, p. 128.
 B. Matthews, "Parts of Speech ; Essays in English." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 A. Duff, "Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 Budge, "Egypt and the Neolithic and Archaic Periods." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 S. Daggau, "Eastern Question." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1903 Socin, "Diwan Aus Centralarabien," Vol. IV, 300 p.; Vol. IV, 146 p.; Vol. X, 354 p. *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. XIX, January, pp. 122-6.
 A. B. Davidson, "The Called of God: Sermons." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 E. E. Butler, "Old Testament Word Studies." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 J. B. Rotheram, "Emphasized Bible." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 A. Danziger, "Jewish Forerunners of Christianity." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 E. Gosse, "Short History of the Literature of the World, English Translation of Cl. Huart's 'Littérature Arabe'." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1904 R. S. Morrison, "History of Egypt." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 M. H. Phelps, "Life and Teachings of Abbas Effendi." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 A. R. Wells, "Into all the World." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 H. P. Beach, "Princely Man in the Heavenly Kingdom." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 C. C. Creegan, "Pioneer Missionaries of the Church." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 Fagnani, "Primer of Hebrew." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 W. A. Shedd, "Islam and the Oriental Churches." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 Newberry and Garstang, "Short History of Ancient Egypt." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 R. E. Diffendorfer, "Child Life in Muslim Lands." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1905 Genung, "Words of Koheleth." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 S. M. Zwemer, "Moslem Doctrine of God." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1906 D. S. Margoliouth, "Mohammed and the Rise of Islam." *The Church Quarterly Review*, pp. 357-80.
 T. Aitken, "Little Commentary on Job." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 W. Rosenau, "Jewish Biblical Commentators." *Hartford Seminary Record*.

- 1907 H. H. Wright, "Daniel and his Prophecies." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 Peloubet, "Studies in Job." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 Genung, "Hebrew Literature of Wisdom in the Light of Today: a Synthesis"; "The Mohammedan World of Today." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 J. B. Pratt, "Psychology of Religious Belief." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 W. E. Smyser, "Tennyson, in Modern Poets and Christian Teaching Series." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 Sir J. Redhouse, "Translation of 'Pearl Strings of al-Khazraji'." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1908 L. B. Paton, "Jerusalem in Modern Times." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*.
 Yakut's "Biographical Dictionary, edited by Margoliouth." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*.
- 1909 "Al-Khazraji, Vols. II and III." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 "Ibn Miskawayh, Vol. I." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1910 "Arabic for the Wayfarer," a Review of H. H. Spoer and E. Nasrallah Heddad, "Manual of Palestinian Arabic for Self Instruction." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, pp. 92-4.
- 1911 Margoliouth, "Yakut, Vol. III, Part I." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 W. H. Bennett, "The Moabite Stone." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
 G. A. Barton, "Commentary on Job." *Hartford Seminary Record*.
- 1913 "Some Recent Literature on Islam." *International Review of Missions*, pp. 373-8.
 S. H. Leeder, "Veiled Mysteries of Egypt and the Religion of Islam." *International Review of Missions*, pp. 595-8.
- 1917 "A Dutch Arabist on Islam," a review of C. Snouck Hurgronje, "Mohammedanism," New York and London, 1916. *International Review of Missions*.
- 1918 "A Modern Method Grammar," a review of W. H. T. Gairdner (assisted by Sheikh Kurayyim Sallām), "Egyptian Colloquial Arabic," Cambridge, 1917. *International Review of Missions*.
- 1918 J. L. de Lanessan, "La Tunisia," vi, 308 p., Paris, 1917. *The Moslem World*, p. 432.
 Emile Auble, "Bagdad, son chemin de fer, son importance, son avenir," 168 p., Paris, 1917. *The Moslem World*, p. 432.
 Edouard Driault, "La question d'Orient depuis ses origines jusqu'à la grande guerre," xvi, 432 p., Paris, 1917. *The Moslem World*, p. 433.
- 1919 Azimuddin Ahmad, "Die auf Sudarabien bezuglichen Angaben Nashwan's im Shams al-'ulūm," xxiv, 44, 164 p., Leyden, 1916. *The Moslem World*, pp. 211 f.
 Miguel Asín Palacios, "La Escatología Musulmana en la Divina Comedia," 404 p., Madrid, 1919. *The Moslem World*, pp. 432 f.

- 1919 A. J. Wensinck, "Bar Hebraeus 'Book of the Dove,'" cxxxvi, 152 p., Leyden, 1919. *The Moslem World*, pp. 433 f.
 M. Asín, "La Escatologia Musulmana en la Divina Comedia." *The Review*, June 2.
- 1920 George Foote Moore, "History of Religions, II. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism," 552 p., New York, 1919. *The Moslem World*, pp. 95 f.
 Shaikh Abdullah bin Shaikh Murtada, "Ath-thimār ash-shahiya fī tārikh al-ismā'īliya, 20 p., Beirut, 1919. *The Moslem World*, pp. 306 f.
 H. Lammens, "Ziād ibn Abihi," 139 p., Rome, 1912; "Mo'āwiya I," 49 p., Rome, 1915. *The Moslem World*, pp. 307 f.
 H. W. Weitbrecht Stanton, "The Teaching of the Qur'ān," London, 1919. *International Review of Missions*, pp. 125-6.
- 1921 Ignaz Goldziher: "Le Dogma et la Loi de l'Islam. Traduction de Félix Arin," viii, 318 p., Paris, 1920. *Isis*, Vol. IV, pp. 64-6. Also in *International Review of Missions*, pp. 559-61.
- 1922 "A History of the Arabs in the Sudan and some Account of the People who Preceded them and of the Tribes inhabiting Darfur," by H. A. MacMichael, D.S.O., Sudan Political Service; in two volumes. (Cambridge University Press, 1922. xxii, 347 p.; viii, 488 p.) *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 128 f.
 Edward G. Browne, "Arabian Medicine," viii, 138 p., Cambridge, 1921. *Isis*, Vol. IV, pp. 349 f.
 Heinrich Frick, "Gazali's Selbstbiographia, ein Vergleich mit Augustens Konfessionen," iv, 84 p., Leipzig, 1919. *Isis*, Vol. IV, p. 508.
 José A. Sánchez Pérez, "Biografías de matemáticos árabes que florecieron en España," Madrid, 1921. *Isis*, Vol. IV, pp. 537 f.
 Lothrop Stoddard, "The New World of Islam," viii, 362 p., New York, 1921. *Isis*, Vol. IV, pp. 538 f.
 De Lacy O'Leary, "Arabic Thought and its Place in History," viii, 320 p., London, 1922. *Isis*, Vol. IV, pp. 539 f.
- 1923 "Al-Hallāj, Martyr Mystique de l'Islam, exécuté à Bagdad le 26 Mars 922: Étude d'histoire religieuse," par Louis Massignon; in two volumes (Paris; Paul Geuthner, 1922, xxxii, 460 p.; xii, 461-942 p.; 106, and 28 plates).
 "Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane," par Louis Massignon (Paris: Geuthner, 1922, 304 p., 104 p., autographed texts illustrative of the lexicography). *American Historical Review*, January, pp. 297-9.
 "La Música de las Cantigas," estudio sobre su Origeny Naturaleza con reproducciones fotográficas del texto y transcripción moderna por Julian Ribera de las Reales Academias Española y de la Historia (Madrid: Typografía de la Revista de Archivos, 1922, 14, 156, 346 p). *American Historical Review*, April, pp. 530 f.

- 1923 "Le Bolchevisme et l'Islam. I. Les organisations Soviétiques de la Russie Musulmane," par Joseph Castagne. II. "Hors de Russie" (Revue du monde Musulman, publiée par la Mission Scientifique du Maroc de 1907-1921, Vols. LI, LII; xvii, 254 p.; xiii, 254 p. (Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1922). *American Historical Review*, July, pp. 751-3.
- 1924 Victor Chauvin, "Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885. XII Le Mahometisme." vi, 468 p., Liège, 1913-1922. *Isis*, Vol. IV, p. 199.
Maurice Gaudet-Demombynes, "La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks d'après les auteurs Arabes," cxx, 288 p., Paris, 1923. *Isis*, Vol. VI, pp. 561-3.
P. J. André, "L'Islam et les Races," xvi, 270, 326 p., Paris, 1922. *Isis*, Vol. VI, pp. 563 f.
- 1925 "The Caliphate," by Sir Thomas W. Arnold, C.E.E., Litt.D., Professor of Arabic, University of London School of Oriental Studies; 223 p., Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press; 1924. *American Historical Review*, April, pp. 581-3.
Adele Goodrich-Freer (Mrs. H. H. Spoer), "Arabs in Tent and Town," 325 p., London, 1924. *Isis*, Vol. VII, p. 572.
Maurice Gaudet-Demombynes, "Le Pèlerinage à la Mekke," viii, 332 p., Paris, 1923. *Isis*, Vol. VIII, pp. 209 f.
M. Bouyges, "Le 'Kitāb ad-dīn wa 'd-dawlat' édité et traduit par Mr. A. Mingana, est-il authentique?" 16 p., Beyrouth, 1924. *The Moslem World*, pp. 210 f.
- 1926 "La Musica Andaluza Medieval," por Julian Ribera, 64 p. of text, 68 p. of music, Madrid (Maestre), 1925. *American Historical Review*, January, p. 348.
Baron Carra de Vaux, "Les Penseurs de l'Islam," Vol. IV, 384 p., Paris, 1923. *Isis*, Vol. VIII, p. 598.
Richard Bell, "The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment," *The Moslem World*, pp. 309 f.
"The Hope for the Moslem People," a review of: Felix Valyi, "Social and Political Revolutions in Islam," Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.; E. G. Mears, "Modern Turkey," The Macmillan Company; Sir T. W. Arnold, "The Caliphate," Oxford University Press; and A. Guillaume, "The Traditions of Islam," Oxford University Press. *The Yale Review*, July, pp. 819-21.
- 1927 "Recent Spanish Arabic Studies": Notes on *Abenházam de Córdoba y su Historia Crítica de las Ideas Religiosas*, por Miguel Asín Palacios, 346 p., Madrid, 1927; *Colección de Obras Árabigas de Historia y Geografía, que publica la Real Academia de la Historia*; tomo segundo, *Historia de la Conquista de España de Abenelcofia el Cordobés* . . . traducción de Don Julián Ribera, xxxii, 186, 232 p., Madrid, 1926; *Los Reyes de Taifas: Estudio Histórico-Numismático de los Musulmanes Españoles en el Siglo V. de la Hégira*, XI. de

- J.C., por Antonio Prieto y Vives, 280 p., Madrid, 1926; *Un Cuento Árabe Fuente Común de Abentofál y de Gracián*, 100 p., Madrid, 1926, and *La Forêt aux Pucelles*, 24 p., Madrid, 1927, both by Professor Emilio García Gómez. *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 78 f.
- "Handbuch der Altarabischen Altertumskunde," herausgegeben von Dr. Ditlef Nielsen in Verbindung mit Geheimrat F. Hommel und Professor N. Rhodokanakis, mit Beiträgen von Professor Adolf Grohmann und Geheimrat Enno Littmann, Band I, "Die Altarabische Kultur," viii, 272 p., Copenhagen (Arnold Busck) 1927. *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 91 f.
- 1927 "Cheikh Mohammed Abdou Rissalat al Tawhid," par B. Michael et le Cheikh Abdel Razik, xv, 150 p., Paris, 1925. *Isis*, Vol. IX, pp. 456 f.
- 1928 "Tahafot al-falasifat," Maurice Bouyges, xxx, 448 p., Beyrouth, 1927. *Isis*, Vol. X, pp. 497-9.
- "Lawrence and the Arabian Adventure," R. Graves, Doubleday, Doran & Co. *The Yale Review*, autumn, pp. 457-9.
- "Bibliographie des œuvres de Ignace Goldziher," Bernard Heller, xviii, 101 p., Paris, 1927. *Isis*, Vol. XI, p. 228.
- "Biographien Muhammads, seiner Gefährten, und der Späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht. Ibn Saad," herausgegeben von Eduard Sachau, in nine volumes, Leiden (E. J. Brill), 1905-1928. *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 154 f.
- 1929 "Disertaciones y Opúsculos de Julián Ribera y Tarragó, de las Reales Academias Española y de la Historia," edición colectiva que en su jubilación del Profesorado le ofrecen sus discípulos y amigos (1887-1927). Con una introducción de Miguel Asín Palacios, de la Reales Academias Espanola, de la Historia y de Ciencias Morales y Políticas. Tomo I, "Literatura, Historia y Cultura Arabe, lo Científico en al Historia"; tomo II, "Historia de la Musica, Historia Arabe Valenciana, el Problema de Marruecos, Ensenanza y Miscelanea," cxvi, 638 p.; viii, 796 p., Madrid (Estanislao Maestre), 1928. *American Historical Review*, January, pp. 304-7.
- "La Berberie Orientale sous la Dynastia des Benou 'l-Arlab, 800-909," par M. Vonderheyden, Docteur ès-Lettres, 331 p., Paris, 1927 (Geuthner). *American Historical Review*, July, pp. 799-801.
- "An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usamah Ibn-Munqidh (Kitāb Al-I'tibār)," translated from the original manuscript by Philip K. Hitti, Princeton University, x, 265 p., New York (Columbia University Press), 1929. *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 154 f.
- G. Sarton, "Introduction to the History of Science, Vol. I." *Speculum*, Vol. IV, No. 4, October, pp. 486-92.

- 1930 "La España del Cid," por Ramon Menéndez Pidal. Dibujos de Pedro Muguruza. Two volumes, with maps and genealogical charts, iv, 1006 p., Madrid (Editorial Plutarco (S.A.)), 1929. *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 110 f.
- "Los Mozárabes de Toledo en los Siglos XII y XIII," por Angel Gonzales Palencia. Four volumes. viii, 324 p.; vi, 342 p.; iv, 598 p.; xvi, 462 p., Madrid (Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan), 1926, 1928, 1930. *American Historical Review*, October, pp. 112-14.
- 1931 "The Life of Mahomet," by Emile Dermenghem, xii, 353 p., New York (Dial Press) 1930. *American Historical Review*, January, p. 421.
- "A Literary History of the Arabs," Reynold A. Nicholson, M.A., Litt. D., F.B.A., Sir Thomas Adams's Professor of Arabic and Fellow of Trinity College in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge University Press; xxxi, 506 p., New York (The Macmillan Company), 1930, second edition. *American Historical Review*, April, p. 659.
- "El Islam Cristianizado: Estudio del "Sufismo" a traves de las Obras de Abenarabi de Murcia," por Miguel Asin Palacios. Dibujos de Carlos de Miguel. 544 p., Madrid (Editorial Plutarco), 1931. *American Historical Review*, October, p. 96.
- "Historical Facts for the Arabian Musical Influence," George Henry Farmer. xii, 376 p., London, 1930. *Isis*, Vol. XV, pp. 370-2.

BOOKS DEDICATED TO DR. MACDONALD

- 1923 *The Idea of Personality in Sufism*, Three Lectures Delivered in the University of London, by Reynold A. Nicholson, Cambridge University Press, 1923.
- 1924 *Al-Ghazzali's Mishkat al-Anwar (The Niche for Lights)*, a translation with introduction, by W. H. T. Gairdner (inscribed to the memory of Ignaz Goldziher and to Duncan Black Macdonald), London (Royal Asiatic Society), 1924.
- 1925 *Worship in Islam*, being a Translation, with Commentary and Introduction of al-Ghazzali's Book of the Ihya on the Worship, by Edwin Elliott Calverley, Madras (Christian Literature Society for India), 1925.
- 1928 *Al-Bābu 'l-Hādī 'Ashar*, a Treatise on the Principles of Shi'ite Theology, translated from the Arabic by William McElwee Miller, London (Royal Asiatic Society), 1928.
- 1930 *Indian Islam, a Religious History of Islam in India*, by Murray T. Titus, Oxford University Press, 1930.